DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 096 SP 017 328

AUTHOR Howey, Kenneth R.
TITLE School Focused In-Service Education. Clarification of a New Concept and Strategy. Synthesis Report. In-Service Education and Training of Teachers: Towards New Policies.
INSTITUTION Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris (France). Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 81p.: For related documents, see SP 017 325-326.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role: *Global Approach: Government Role: *Inservice Teacher Education: Institutional Cooperation: Postsecondary Education: Program Effectiveness: *Program Evaluation: Teacher Associations: *Teacher Centers: Teacher Education Programs: *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

Current thinking about and operational examples of school-focused inservice teacher education are synthesized. The primary data sources for this report were the ideas and materials shared in case studies conducted in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States. The report begins by examining how several writers have contributed to defining school-focused inservice and explores the various rationales they put forth which support this type of continuing education. The state of the art of school-focused inservice teacher education in various countries is also briefly reviewed. Next, several problems that appear with this type of inservice are examined along with some suggestions for their possible resolution. Some roles that each of the basic parties associated with inservice could assume in this improvement process are noted. The roles of teacher organizers, administrators, the government, and colleges are examined. Finally, the report examines teacher centers as they contribute to the concept of inservice. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198096

centre for educational research and innovation

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF TEACHERS :

TOWARDS NEW POLICIES

School Focused In-Service Education
Clarification of a New Concept and Strategy

SYNTHESIS REPORT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Lieberare

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 017328

OECD ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND INNOVATION
(CERI)

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF TEACHERS: TOWARDS NEW POLICIES

School Focused In-Service Education

Clarification of a new concept and strategy

Synthesis Report

by

Kenneth R. Howey
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota, U.S.A.

The views expressed are those of the author
and do not commit either the Organisation
or the National authorities concerned

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT
1980

1475

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
TOWARD A DEFINITION	2
THE GENERAL STATE OF THE ART	17
PROBLEMS TO BE RESOLVED	21
Finding time	21
Adequate inducements for participation	23
Support for INSET	24
Leadership for Inservice	27
Improved conceptualization of INSET	33
Cooperation and coordination	36
Adequate documentation and evaluation	37
TOWARDS A RESOLUTION OF THE PROBLEMS	40
Role of teachers	40
The role of the professional teacher organizations	45
Role of the building administrator	45
The role of the community	48
The role of higher education	52
The role of state and federal governments	58
TEACHER CENTERS	59
Introduction	59
Toward a definition	63
The independent teacher center	66
The "almost" independent teacher center	66
The professional organization teacher center	66
The single unit teacher center	67
The free partnership teacher center	67
The free consortium teacher center	68
The legislative/political consortium teacher center	68
The facilitation type teacher center	69
The advocacy type teacher center	70
The responsive type teacher center	70
The functionally unique teacher center	70
SUMMARY	72
BIBLIOGRAPHY	76

INTRODUCTION

This report is an attempt to synthesize current thinking about and operational examples of school-focused inservice (INSET). The primary data sources for this report are a number of case studies on this facet of teacher education commissioned by CERI/OECD. The author from time to time also draws upon other studies and analytic pieces concerned with school-focused INSET. The report, however, is limited basically to the ideas and materials which were shared in the case studies conducted in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States. Materials the author received describing school-focused efforts in England are also incorporated. The final section of this synthesis briefly examines teacher centers as they contribute to school-focused practices on the basis of reports from Australia, the Netherlands, Italy, England and the United States. It is obvious that this attempt at a synthesis is limited almost exculsively to Anglo-Saxon perspectives. Hopefully this personal interpretation of those viewpoints will complement in a small way the richness and diversity of ideas about inservice represented in other countries and cultures which unfortunately could not be included in this report.

The report begins by examining how several writers have contributed to defining school-focused inservice and explores the various rationales they put forth which support this type of continuing education. The state of the art of school-focused INSET in various countries is also briefly reviewed. Next several problems attendant to this type of inservice are examined along with some suggestions for their possible resolution. Some roles each of the basic parties associated with inservice might play in this improvement process are noted. Finally, the report examines teacher centers as they contribute to the concept of school-focused INSET.

TOWARD A DEFINITION

A principal aim of the CERI/OECD-sponsored case studies was to assist in clarifying the concept of school-focused INSET. Much of the initiative for and preliminary effort behind the concept of school-focused INSET occurred in England. In many respects this inservice approach has been a grass-roots development, a creature of the pragmatic English tradition. Certainly, however, both scholars and school authorities in that country have contributed to the evolution of the concept as well. Bolam, whose history of work in this area is well known, notes that much of the stimulus for school-focused INSET was related to increased teacher participation in curriculum development in the schools. In his review of the genesis of school focused efforts in Britain, he quotes from a British Schools Council report as follows:

> "...we want to highlight what we see as being the key concepts in our report. Among the most important of these is the idea of the school as a centre of curriculum development. We believe the improvement of the secondary-school curriculum must rest upon an acknowledgement of the central role of the teacher. All worthwhile proposals for curriculum change are put to the test in classrooms and only come to fruition if the practicing teacher has the resources, support, training and self-confidence to implement them. Teachers are in a unique position to know and understand the needs of pupils and from them should come the principal pressure for increasingly effective programmes of teaching and learning. Because we see the development of the curriculum and the self-development of the teacher as being inseparable, we call for vigorous programmes of in-service education and school-based curriculum development, both of which are essential if the teachers are to perform their role to the full." (1976, p. 80)

The development of school-based resource centers in England, particularly in comprehensive schools, also contributed to a more defined concept of school-focused inservice. Several factors came together which let creative school faculties start these centers "from scratch" so to speak. Most prominent among these were a more integrated approach to curriculum design and a greatly

increased proliferation of national curriculum projects. While these projects often implied considerable changes for the teachers, they were limited on the other hand in the range of materials, support and time which they provided for the teachers. At this same time there was also a growing practice of mixed-ability grouping and more attention to teaching methods which stressed inquiry and investigative methods. These conditions led in several instances then to the improvisation of existing rooms and resources to provide more support for teacher development of a school-focused nature.

Pauline Perry, H.M.I., in her keynote address at the International Workshop on Strategies for School-focused Inservice in the Unites States in 1977, stated:

> The case has been cogently made that to ensure true implementation of change...we must work with teachers in the place and in the situation where change is to take place. The case is made with equal cogency that the school-building is the context in which all needs at all levels of the system ultimately come together.

In this same address she also underscored that all school-focused training need not be, indeed should not be, school-based. She suggested that all strategies employed by trainers and teachers in partnership to direct training programs in such a way as to meet the identified needs of (specific) schools and which raise the standards of teaching and learning in schools can be construed as school-focused.

Bolam along with others was also part of a small group commissioned by the Department of Education and Science (D.E.S.) and the Welsh Office to prepare a discussion paper for teachers on INSET. The resultant paper titled Making INSET Work (1978) outlines four practical steps to assist teachers and school faculties in planning their own inservice in the light of needs which they have identified. One of the real benefits of this publication and of particular help here are the variety of options enunciated as forms of school-focused INSET with the clear intent that other schools and teachers be seen as valuable "providing

agencies" in terms of continuing teacher development. Some of the examples of school-focused inservice shared in this booklet include:

- A home economics teacher spends a day in another school to find out about a new child-care course.
- Two deputy heads in very different primary schools exchange jobs for one week to broaden their experience.
- A large comprehensive school timetable frees staff for one week each year to work on materials prepration with the resource center coordinator.
- Two colleagues in the same school systematically observe each other teaching over a term and discuss their observations after each session.
- A group of comprehensive school staff developing a new integrated-studies curriculum invite a teachers' center warden to coordinate a term-long school-based course involving outside speakers.
- A college of education offers a week-long course for primary schools for four weeks in succession. Each of four members of staff attend in turn thus having a similar experience. College staff follow-up by visiting the schools.
- Two LEA advisers offer a school-based course of eight weekly sessions on primary maths. They spend from 3.0 to 3.45 working with teachers in their classrooms and from 4.0 to 5.30 in follow-up workshop discussion sessions.
- A university award-bearing course for a group of staff from the same school includes a substantial school-based component.
- A school runs a conference on "Going Comprehensive" which begins on Friday morning, in school time, and ends on Saturday afternoon. Outside speakers include a chief adviser, a comprehensive head and a university lecturer. As a result, several working parties run throughout the following year. (1978, pp. 7, 8)

Another recent United Kingdom paper also addressed the concept of school-focused INSET:

> There is an increasing interest in basing some INSET activities more directly upon the concerns of functioning groups in the school (a departmental team, the heads of house, the whole staff), or on focusing upon a specific innovation or problem, and for some purposes this method may be more effective than the traditional course attended by individual teachers. The fact that such INSET is school-focused does not mean that it has to be school-based. It can take place either on or off the job, and can be provided either by outside agencies or by the school itself. Neither does this school-focused perspective mean that all the normal processes of staff discussion within the school should be labeled as INSET. The latter usually implies some external stimulus, a deliberate intention to become trained or to train or educate, and also some standing back from, and analysis of, the teaching task. This last element is important, and it may be missing in some school-based activities which familiarize newcomers with existing procedures in the school, or introduce existing staff to new procedures, but do not provide or encourage any scrutiny of the educational justification for those procedures, and so do not really forward the professional development of the teachers concerned. (ACSTT, 1974) [Underlined portion done so by this writer for emphasis]

Hence we see that this perspective of school-focused inservice suggests that it may occur in several places and involve several persons in providing assistance as long as the focus is on the problems and concerns of functioning groups in a school. What is underscored in this definition, however, is that not all discussions in schools, even when they focus on problems of that school, should be construed as school-focused inservice. Rather there must be a deliberate intention to become trained or to train, and also some standing back from, and analysis of the teaching task. This seems from this perspective an important distinction as it emphasizes that continuing education activities which are school-focused in nature are indeed not limited to "how to" activities but must stress as well the deliberate and reflective analysis of what is or what should or might happen in the day-to-day activities of a school.

Henderson (1979) also underscores that an inservice approach which is strictly school-based has inherent limitations. He cautions that any school

that would draw exclusively on its own resources for inservice runs the risk of parochialism. On the other hand, when one wishes to bring in personnel from the wider educational world in a constancy mode to a specific school, he notes the problem of expense both in terms of human resources and cash. Thus he concludes that the potential effectiveness of the school-based model is often a function of size. School-based INSET is likely to occur more frequently in a richer and larger secondary school than in a smaller and relatively isolated primary school. Henderson also addresses another basic issue in school-based inservice efforts. He is concerned that the professional development of the school as a unit has the potential to dominate the professional development of individual staff members, since the needs and interest of the individual faculty member are not necessarily congruent with concerns the collective faculty must address. Thus a school-focused approach must attend to both sets of needs. One additional point underscored by Henderson is that inservice schemes must stress professional growth and not deficiency analysis. He states:

> A methodology which attempts [only] to identify the deficiencies of individual teachers with a view to correcting them is doomed to failure. Rather, the methodology must involve cooperative, professional self-evaluation. This does not, of course, imply that needs analysis should only be an inward-looking process. Some needs will arise from the interaction of the professional aspirations of the school and of its individual teachers with the needs of parents, the local community, the region, and the nation, as well as with new knowledge about educational methods. The problem is how to incorporate all these elements into the school's analysis. (Henderson, 1979, p. 22)

Forrest, in his New Zealand case study, also stresses that school-focused inservice activities are not necessarily school-based. He does, however, see the impetus for the inservice activity coming from the school itself. That is to say persons within the school define the area of interest or the particular problems to be pursued. He acknowledges, as Henderson does, that while the impetus comes from within the system itself and the inservice activity is focused

on aspects of a specific school context, this does not imply that the school should or could rely solely on its own resources to come to terms with the issues under study. He states:

> If this were the case, such training is likely to be confined to either the confirmation of existing prejudices and the sharing of ignorances or discipleship of some influential individual; or an ad hoc response to superficially diagnosed problems superficially explored. The support of outside agencies (and persons) to assist both in the identification of areas of need and in exploring ways of meeting these needs is an important function in school-focused training. (Forrest, 1979, draft copy).

He also underscores the need for explicit conceptual guidelines. He notes that the professional and managerial skills of the teacher must be underlined by a sound knowledge of relevant theory. Curriculum changes and innovations call for a thorough knowledge of both content and process. He also addresses the need for more sustained and intensive inservice teacher education. He states that a greater emphasis in New Zealand is being placed on school-based forms of inservice and that there are more substantial attempts to meet locally identified needs. Increased teacher involvement is also noted in his report as he states that there is a trend toward more workshop-type inservice courses where teachers can plan, participate, and develop outcomes that suit them.

Fullan in his review of activities in Canada begins his report by quoting the broad definition of school-focused inservice provided by CERI as a starting point in further clarifying the concept;

> School-focused training is all the strategies employed by trainers and teachers in partnership to direct training programs in such a way as to meet the identified needs of the school and to raise the standard of teaching and learning in the classroom. (Fullan, 1979, p. 2)

Fullan reviews the rather sparse research literature to identify a number of conditions which contribute to effective school-focused INSET. The research he reviews appears to suggest that inservice is likely to be more effective when: (1) the program or project is an integral part of a larger scheme to

bring about school improvement; (2) teachers are centrally involved in both the planning and implementation of the inservice activities; (3) individual differences are accommodated; (4) activities go beyond the sharing of information and include such activities as demonstrations, supervised trials, and feedback; and (5) when more complex teacher behaviors are the focus of inservice. It would appear in many cases that school-based programs are a more appropriate context to incorporate such features than those inservice efforts based in universities or other external agencies.

Fullan warns us, however, that the identification of general ad hoc factors which are associated with effective inservice is a far cry from being able to integrate and develop a conceptually coherent yet practical scheme of inservice for a school. He illustrates vividly the fragmented and unrelated nature of so many inservice activities by referring to a recent study by Nash and Ireland (1979). These investigators were able to identify only three instances in some 40 school districts where there appeared to be any relationship between what had been stated as curriculum priorities and inservice which addressed those priorities. Fullan also underscores the fundamental relationship between curriculum implementation and inservice in his report. If I might insert my own perspective here the relationship between inservice and organizational development and adult (psychological) development are also critically important. Better understanding of how these major variables interact with one another is needed in order to develop a more coherent framework for school-focused inservice.

School-focused INSET is often associated with curriculum development. Thus, a major concern which Fullan addresses is the common preoccupation on the development of curriculum materials and the neglect of requisite teacher behaviors needed to implement desired curriculum changes. Fullan states:

> Simply put, curriculum implementation involves change in people (attitude, knowledge, skills, behavior) as well as in material and structure. The failure of implementation has been one of a lack of concern with and an inability to deal with the role changes which are part and parcel, and indeed, the least defined and most difficult aspects of implementation. (Fullan, 1979, p. 11)

The Canadian writer also reminds us of the need for conceptual clarity. This conceptual clarity is not something which comes easily, however, and rarely is it achieved at the outset of an INSET project. He quotes McLaughlin and Marsh who reviewed the Rand Study of attempts by the federal government to promote change in the schools in the United States. These scholars concluded:

> Conceptual clarity may be fostered--but cannot be assured--by specific project goal statements or by the use of packaged material, or by lectures from outside consultants. The conceptual clarify critical to project (INSET) success and continuation must be achieved during the process of implementation--it cannot be given to staff at the outset. (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978, p. 80)

The importance of sustained and intensive inservice activities, especially when teachers are asked to learn more complex teaching behaviors, is well-illustrated by the work of Joyce (1979). In his efforts to work with teachers in the development of a broader repertoire of generic teaching strategies he found that the inservice program had to contain all five of the following elements---theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching--if teachers were to alter classroom practice. In a similar vein, Hall (1978) has examined the concerns and attitudes of teachers over time as they engaged in proposed innovations. This data suggests that teacher development and the utilization of new strategies or materials, especially those of a more complex nature, is a developmental process of learning which frequently takes place over two or more years. A basic message communicated by Fullan, then, is that inservice should be viewed as a process and not an event: a continuing process of role change which involves new knowledge, new skills, and new behavior.

Fullan further suggests that an effective inservice program, especially one of any magnitude, involves essentially a resocialization process. This process can be externally, self, or collaboratively induced. Thus he recommends that socialization theory, as well as learning theory and organizational theory, be utilized in planning and guiding school-focused inservice programs.

From this perspective there is strong agreement that inservice efforts have frequently lacked a conceptual framework, or at least theoretical principles, to guide them. We have not paid enough attention to how the conditions and norms of the work place and the personal growth process of the teacher have affected desired professional growth for example. At the same time it seems too much has been made of inservice being either theoretical or practical. Often a spurious dichotomy exists. Fox, in his preliminary synthesis of the reports on evaluation of school-focused INSET for OECD, makes this point when he states:

> Theory and practice, thought and action, ideology and performance, are not separate, and their separation has crucial consequences to the failure of most INSET programs. The distinction between theory and practice is an historical phenomenon, a human creation rather than a natural or rational course of events. Although there are extensive impinging factors that help explain this phenomenon, e.g., the specialization of work, it is not a necessary distinction. The actor has theory. The theoretician has practice. The actor is influenced by theory and the theoretician is influenced by practice. It is at least problematic whether the problem is for the theoretician to talk to the actor (or vice versa) or whether it is for the theoretician to talk about his (her) own practice or the actor to talk about his (her) own theory. (Fox, 1978, p. 8)

As Fullan indicates in his report, we should not be interested in theories per se but rather in locating quite specific indicators which can be used to develop a sense of the meaning of inservice education (one which is as theoretical and as practical as the complex problem of effective inservice requires).

In summary, then, Fullan has identified several guidelines which he sees as essential to a framework for school-focused inservice. There is a need for inservice to be integrated with part of a larger program of change as it relates to both the classroom and the school. He is also concerned that inservice should

often be intensive, sustained and developmental in nature. He underscores the essentiality of teachers being centrally involved in all aspects of in-service, but certainly not to the exclusion of a variety of other key people who are appropriately brought into the process at various times. Above all:

> One needs a plan at the school level and at the school district level which systematically organizes and provides for the concerns just enunciated to happen in an interactive framework. (1979, p. 20)

Ingvarson, the Australian author, notes in the introduction to his case study (1978) that the examples he chose to share depended upon the availability of detailed reports of school-focused programmes and many programmes had not been written up. He also notes that even among those programmes that have been written up, none provides evidence of any changes of "hard" long-term benefit to teachers or to pupils. Therefore he notes that school-focused INSET is obviously an area where further development and research is warranted if the concept:

> ...which has such obvious practical rationale, is not to sink to the status of another passing fad. Modest evaluation studies of current practice, combined with a critical appraisal of ideas, research, and theories about teacher development, are what seem to be needed, however, not massive descriptive research studies. (1978, p. 13)

At the outset of his Australian report, Ingvarson does review a study of the value teachers perceived in various types of school-focused activity. This listing of activities, as do the British examples, underscores the variety of inservice endeavors which can be engaged in of a school-focused nature. The activities he identifies include, among others: short meetings, residential conferences for the entire staff, whole-day activities for the staff held at the school or other venue, visits from consultants, interchange with or visits to other schools, interaction with parents, short conferences (1-3 days), in-depth curriculum study of materials, developmental workshops (2-5 weeks release),

whole-term release, activities which examine problems of an organizational curricular nature that face the staff of a particular school, [illegible] classroom-based action research with consultancy report, teachers' center or education center activities, an extended (developmental) series of meetings, and finally residential inservice education programs. Ingvarson reports that teachers were unequivocable in this survey in that that time with other teachers was of prime importance to them in gaining and using teaching ideas, among all the possible strategies employed.

Ingvarson reviews the role of The Schools Commission in advancing school-focused inservice in Australia. The Schools Commission was established in 1973 by the then new Labor government as an independent body for advice and policy analysis. It also administers the spending of money authorized by the federal government. Two of the major principles that The Schools Commission reaffirmed were that the teaching profession itself should take a leading part in directing its own improved functioning (INSET) and that perhaps the most important single unit of teachers is the total group involved in the work of the school.

Thus this Commission places its confidence, as Ingvarson reports, in the school as the most significant unit for change and in teachers as the most appropriate source of ideas for their own continuing development. The devolution or decentralization of responsibility is a political principle which runs through the reports of The Schools Commission. They suggest a more prominent role in inservice not only for the teaching profession itself, especially in the form of school faculties, but for the lay public who support these schools as well. He quotes from the report of an interim committee for The Australian Schools Commission as follows:

> Responsibility should be devolved, as far as possible, upon the people involved in the actual task of schooling, in consultation with the parents of the pupils whom they teach, and, at senior levels, with the students themselves. (1973, p. 10)

And again quoting from a later report by The Schools Commission, he reports:

> The Commission has consistently taken the view that the improvement of schools lies not just in the quality of the actual decisions taken about how to improve them, but in the processes through which those decisions are reached. Three of its special programs...actively promote a process which encourages people to analyze the situation in which they are placed, to identify directions of needed change and improvement, and to propose actions addressed to them. This is the process which is central to improved school effectiveness through extended school-based decision making. It is designed to encourage initiative, self-reliance, and commitment among people who will implement changed directions of action. (1978, p. 13)

Ingvarson reports that a recent national evaluation identified the following characteristics of school-focused inservice which were viewed as advantageous over other forms of inservice: (1) continuity, (2) follow-up and support, and (3) the actual implementation of new ideas. The report also notes that this form of inservice incorporated the greater involvement of parents and ancillary staff. Further, he states that school-focused inservice can overcome the problem of the uninvolved through "peer group pressure" which was often the most effective means of influencing teachers to participate in constructive ways toward bringing about needed change.

He also reviews literature on the circulation and dissemination of innovations in Australia which suggest that face-to-face contact is most important between those who desire change and those involved in effecting such change. A primary goal of school-focused inservice then, is to enable this face-to-face contact to happen in the context of clearly identified problems of mutual concern. Ingvarson amply makes the point for why more face-to-face interaction is needed when he states:

> If the opportunity for task-related interaction could be compared among groups such as inspectors, advisors, consultants, academics, and teachers, teachers would possibly have the lowest interaction of all. Ideas can move quickly among inspectors, principals, consultants, and advisors, because of their greater access to each other both formally and informally and because of the time available. There is also greater likelihood that ideas untested by classroom realities will be ideas in good currency amongst non-classroom teachers... (1978, p. 9)

The Australian study stresses such interaction among teachers. One of the examples in the Ingvarson report is that of a whole-school approach where the entire faculty and student body engaged in a creative education week. Ingvarson interviews the organizer of that particular school-focused inservice approach and that person's comments seem to capture many of the features of school-focused inservice:

> Gains to an individual must be seen as a separate matter from gains to the educational program of a whole staff. If a staff is to function as an integrated working unit, then developmental programs for them must be provided. This concept places inservice training within the ambit of the regular school programme. This does not deny that individual teachers may continue to benefit from withdrawal-based courses, but emphasis is placed in the life of the whole staff as the crux of educational progress in a school.
>
> This proposition assumes a participatory school government style. It implies that subject teachers, as a group and at certain levels, will have educational decisions to share; it assumes that a school philosophy will be developed and activated through establishing objectives around which the program is built; it assumes that there will be a continuing interchange of ideas leading to appraisal of innovatory possibilities; it assumes that a forum will be continually maintained for sharing student-centered concerns, and for school-community relations. None of these issues can be satisfactorily provided for in a school through withdrawal-based inservice training, and few of them can be systematically attended to in brief, task-centered staff meetings. They can be done within a school provided that sufficient time is made available and competent leadership is guaranteed. This may require outside consultants, usually to establish the activity, but it may be done internally. (1978, p. 26)

Ingvarson concludes by suggesting that the place of school-focused INSET is in its potential for supporting three levels of participation or involvement, all of which increase the degree of responsibility exercised by teachers. The first of these he identifies as teaching methods. At this level school-focused inservice should support a willingness to experiment and evaluate various approaches in cooperation between staff members. A fundamental assumption is that the effective teacher differs from the ineffective teacher by his or her openness to change. Ingvarson notes that change is largely a personal process,

and thus there are no short-cuts in change efforts. The process of reinventing the wheel, at least as far as teachers adopting new innovations is concerned, seems to a large extent unavoidable from his perspective. Teachers will have to overcome their pedagogical isolation from each other, and receive greater publicity and rewards for teacher-led research.

The second level he identifies as organizational. Here he sees the need for greater involvement by both teachers and parents in school-wide decisions as they relate to such matters as communication, discipline, scheduling, and student grouping. He states that much more experience is needed in the techniques of institutional evaluation and problem-solving. He indicates that insufficient groundwork, at least in Australia (and I suspect in almost all other countries as well) exists to prepare teachers and parents for their effective participation in such decisions.

The third level of participation he notes is that of teachers in curriculum development. Just as Fullan, he sees this as the most fundamental type of involvement. Ingvarson states:

> The ultimate point of all INSET is the support it gives to curriculum development at the school level. Here the need for the development of skills is greatest, and the provision of appropriate INSET most deficient. (1978, p. 98)

The views which this author shared about school-focused INSET in his review of practices in the Unites States (1979) are in many respects similar to those of the authors of other case studies. I underscored that INSET responses to more immediate and specific problems and the demand for "hands-on" materials and activities must be balanced with introspection and reflection that often only comes when one is able to remove oneself for sufficient periods from the normal course of daily pursuits. What clues we have to this point in time about how to promote basic psychological maturity in adults suggests that alternate periods of action and reflection are essential.

I also cautioned that an emphasis in dealing with problems at the school level or with significant clusters of people within a school should not result in a restricted view of continuing education. Multiple needs and interests among the practicing professionals must be addressed, many of which are idiosyncratic in nature. While there are many other forms of inservice which speak to individual needs and interests, school-focused inservice should also be able to address individual interest and concerns as well as those cross-cutting curricular and organizational concerns which eventually define the scope and nature of a school.

A school-focused inservice agenda should have as a priority the improvement of those conditions and processes which most directly affect the quality of education of students within a given school. How and when and where different students might productively and humanely be engaged with different persons, different subject matter, and different contextual settings and resources are the salient decisions which teachers make. School-focused INSET should address how those decisions can best be made not only by individual teachers within the context of an individual classroom but between teachers in the context of the larger school/community.

This author also reinforced the notion that inservice must be intensive, continuing, and hopefully developmental in nature. When possible, aspects of it should be embedded in the ongoing daily activities of a teacher. Classrooms should be experimental and data-dependent in nature. INSET is not only integrally related with curriculum development, but hopefully with the concept of teacher as researcher, experimenter and problem-solver. I also underscored that every effort should be made to understand how teachers themselves, individually and collectively, can best learn. Teachers must have sufficient time to grapple with the hows, wheres, whens and whys of their own learning and continued development.

In summary, school-focused inservice can be defined as those continuing education activities which focus upon the interest, needs and problems directly related to one's role and responsibilities in a specific school site. These forms of inservice focus not only on individual teacher concerns and needs, but on matters which demand the coordinated efforts of several, if not all, persons in a specific school setting. When appropriate, both members of the larger school community and the student population should have input into decisions about necessary changes in the school and their implications for INSET. These forms of inservice commonly call for changes in the organizational structure and programmatic nature of a school. They have implications for basic role as well as specific behavioral changes. These forms of inservice should take place in the form of an articulated framework which considers dimensions of the organizational/sociological nature of the school and the curriculum and instructional patterns within which teachers work. The basic psychological growth as well as the professional development of the teacher should also be considered.

THE GENERAL STATE OF THE ART

As Fullan stated earlier, being able to identify a number of ad hoc characteristics of school-focused inservice is not at all the same as mounting a coherently-planned approach at the school level. It is clear in reading each of the four case studies that school-focused inservice has a long way to go in each of the countries where activities were reported. For example, in the New Zealand case study when the question of developing organized classes for teachers at the local site was discussed, along with the question of where time would come from for teachers to engage in these activities, the author reports the following:

> At least one area organized classes for teachers as ... to overcome the problem of day release. This in turn ... other problems. At least two locales have asked that one day be set aside for inservice training of all teachers in their particular area. Operating alongside these local area concerns are departmental courses in minority areas, such as remedial reading and guidance counseling. Various teacher associations mount approved courses, and teacher colleges offer several classes for teachers courses. University Continuing Education Centres usually run holiday courses, and in addition several teachers are invited each week to national residential courses. (1979, draft copy.)

Thus, as one can see, there is in New Zealand, as in other countries, access to agencies which offer inservice, often with little or no coordination between them. The effort to mount a more school-focused approach is but one aspect of inservice. There appears to still be a considerable concentration on courses as a means of providing for the continuing education of teachers.

Ingvarson in the Australian report states:

> It would be unwise to conclude from studies such as the study described earlier that school-based INSET has become, or indeed is likely to become, a powerful new model of INSET in Australia. The trend toward school-focused inservice seems to be motivated more by reaction to the perceived ineffectiveness of courses or conferences than by a positive move toward a well thought out model of school-focused inservice education grounded in experience and illustrated by successful examples in evaluation. (1978, p. 10)

The fact that school-focused forms of inservice are not that common in the United States can be amply documented by the data collected in a recent survey of inservice problems and practices in this country conducted by this author along with Yarger and Joyce (Yarger, Howey, & Joyce, 1979). Teachers in the survey were asked about their participation in a number of forms of inservice. While the term school-focused was not employed, the investigators did employ "job-embedded" and "job-related" as descriptors of inservice which teachers would be familiar with. Job-embedded inservice is integrated into the on-going activities of the classroom, such as systematic analysis of a teaching practice. Job-related was defined as inservice related specifically to one's job, regardless

of when and where it occurred. The respondents in the survey reported that they rarely experienced job-embedded inservice. In fact, as many as 60% of the teachers reported that experienced forms of job-embedded inservice as infrequently as once a year. Job-related forms of inservice, which would also fall under the school-focused unbrella, were also rare. Almost half of the teachers reported this as something they engaged in once a year (or less) as well.

When teachers were queried as to whether arrangements were made periodically to accommodate more intensive periods of inservice at the school site, the responses again were consistently negative. Only about one in five teachers reported that they were released from their instructional duties or had school closed for a brief period of time in order for them to take advantage of inservice opportunities of any type on a regular basis. Thus, inservice typically engaged in by teachers in the United States has (1) generally followed a full day's work in the classroom and (2) frequently was not focused on their own specific needs and interest as generated by the conditions of their classroom and school.

Furthermore, those inservice activities external to the school site have been lacking in any on-the-job follow through. Only about 13 percent of the teachers in the survey reported that they received any kind of follow-up assistance on a regular basis.

Fullan, in his Canadian report, underscores a similar problem in that country. He indicates that a great many agencies within Canada invariably recommend the expansion and integration of inservice programs but he summarizes:

> As we have indicated before and will state again, one could characterize these developments as a 'flurry of activity'--there is little integration or rationale either across activities or within given programs in the sense of relating them to particular tasks or follow-through. At the same time on another front, virtually all provinces are immersed in the development/revision and implementation of curriculum guidelines for all subject areas in elementary and secondary schools. There has been at best a loosely coupled relationship between these curriculum implementation efforts and inservice training activities... (1979, p. 23)

In short, the general situation in Canada over the past five years has been the development of expanded, ad hoc inservice activities carried out by several different agencies on the one hand, and the parallel but independent focus on curriculum guidelines and their implementation on the other. Fullan suggests that there is an imbalance between inservice of the general topics variety and job- or school-focused forms of inservice, with the former predominating. Programs with job-related purposes appear not only infrequent but often are ineffectively planned and carried out. The issue is further compounded by the great expansion of inservice activities and proposals.

Thus, we can see that in each of the four countries where case studies were conducted the concept of school-focused inservice appears not to have been widely implemented nor well conceptualized. In the next section of this report, we examine several of the issues and problems which have been identified in the various case studies and which will have to be overcome if progress is to be made.

PROBLEMS TO BE RESOLVED

Finding time. One of the more common problems which needs to be overcome in order to achieve viable forms of school-focused inservice appears to be the matter of finding appropriate amounts of time for teachers to engage in this activity. Fullan reminds us in his Canadian report that virtually all studies of needs have indicated that lack of time and energy for participating in professional development is a fundamental barrier to success.

As we reported earlier, most inservice engaged in by teachers in the United States appears to occur after a full day of teaching with children in a classroom. Fox, in his preliminary synthesis of the papers prepared on the topic of evaluation of school-focused INSET, raised a number of what he called "hard" questions that he believed had not been addressed in the general discussions of school-focused INSET. The question of time is especially critical for him. He writes:

> While I am on the subject of hard questions, let me speak to another issue....One of the most significant features of teaching is that it is an adult job, a profession that may take time and energy well past the hours of direct service. It is these hours that perhaps are some of the more crucial in teaching, and it is these hours upon which INSET encroaches. In some ways, these are private hours, hours that are not the purview of the institution or the local magistrate to infringe upon. INSET is setting a precedent to intervene upon this time. The question, then, is what are the consequences of INSET upon the private professional time of teachers? (1978, p. 63)

Certainly the problem of time is not just a quantitative one. It would seem, however, from this perspective that rather than attempt to delineate what is "private" as opposed to "company" time, one would be better advised to look at how schools could be organized in more creative ways so that teachers could engage in various forms of continuing education throughout the instructional day.

The study group which looked at roles and responsibilities relative to INSET at West Palm Beach in the 1977 workshop identified what from this perspective is a school climate we have to strive for. In the type of context described

below the question of what is private and what is employer time would be basically spurious in nature. A major concern of this group was to create an in-service milieu where there would be both the necessary social/emotional climate and facilitative phy ical conditions for INSET to occur in a natural and on-going manner and often during what is considered the teaching part of the day. This study group was concerned that roles and responsibilities be examined in the context of who has to do what to create and sustain a vibrant and dynamic school setting in which teacher learning would occur in an atmosphere of mutual collegial respect and exchange. They wrote:

> The concept of the teacher role in INSET is a flexible one. Sometimes student, sometimes teacher, problem-solver, confidante, provider of honest feedback...The assumption is that given the right (school) conditions there can be a release of greater talents and energies that we commonly see today in the teacher role. In summary, with respect to the problem of time, it would seem a great deal remains to be done to find both creative and at the same time practical ways in which individual and groups of teachers can engage in a variety of forms of continuing development throughout the school day. One, it would seem, might have to change fundamental conditions in many locales in order that an attitude of experimentation and cooperation not only between teachers but between teachers and students, and between teachers and parents at times can prevail. (1977, p. 7)

However utopian and idealistic such a situation might be, it appears that unless we alter significantly the basic conditions of schools in many situations, we will do little to advance the notion of continuing education in general and school-focused inservice specifically. The question of how to achieve effective inservice is directly related to the job conditions and job satisfaction of the teacher. One can find limited examples of such schools. Fullan in his Canadian case study describes a district where teachers were given considerable time and autonomy to set priorities and identify the nature and type of inservice activities which they would like to pursue in their schools.

One of the schools which he describes was a new open area school which was staffed with teachers who had taught in more traditional physical settings. The types of INSET activities of a school-focused nature which this faculty

engaged in included extensive readings, examining a variety of audiovisual materials, contact with numerous individuals who had experience and expertise in this type of open school visits, to other schools, and study sessions between groups of teachers.

A basic goal in this school-focused approach was to make INSET a natural and ongoing endeavor. Formality was minimized. There was no degree or credit attached to the activities which the teachers engaged in. There was no specific concept of what constitutes "open" education that had to be achieved by these teachers. Rather they shaped the program on the basis of their own needs and interests. Neither was there a formal assessment of the activities that teachers engaged in. It should be noted, however, that a general assessment of the school program itself which was the focus of the inservice indicated high morale by the teachers and high satisfaction by the parents whose children attended the school. Thus, we have a situation where the local school district provided not only time, but also money, personnel, and other desired forms of support to assist individual schools in coming to grips with the major goals and problems they identified. They allowed teachers to assume the primary role both individually and collectively in deciding the direction of inservice.

Adequate Inducements for Participation. A second basic concern identified in the case studies was whether there were appropriate and adequate incentives and benefits for the various persons who participate in INSET--both teachers and instructors. The ideal situation would be one where all of us would be continually self-renewing as individuals regardless of external conditions at any given time. For a variety of understandable reasons, however, many of us find it difficult to sustain such an attitude. The fact that many teachers work in far less than ideal conditions and are unable to find adequate periods of time or reserve satisfactory amounts of energy explains much of the problem.

Likely, however, the question of one's commitment to continuing education goes deeper than questions of released time, appropriate credit, or forms of financial reimbursement. This is not to say that these factors are not important. Obviously they are, and many times serve as the initial mainspring to further learning. It would seem though that those concerned with advancing the state of the art of inservice must examine more critically such bedrock issues as: teacher status, career opportunity, realistic role-expectations, and opportunity to engage in INSET which is consonant with one's basic beliefs. The teacher's perception of just what inservice might actually contribute to improvement of one's job is also critical. These appear to be the touchstones for motivation. We must be concerned with more than questions of time and money. We must focus on questions central to one's professional existence. We must look at future dreams and aspirations. We must centrally address the question of what in fact can INSET do to make a difference in the lives of teachers over both the short and long run.

Support for INSET. Yet, another fundamental concern is how to acquire the basic resources and financial support to carry on inservice, especially inservice that is more organic in nature and integral to the daily lives of teachers. Again this is an issue which has multiple and complex dimensions to it. It is hardly a question of how to provide an occasional honoraria or stipend for teachers who participate in continuing development activities. Rather, in many respects, it goes back again to the central question of how we can make the school more of a place where inquiry, experimentation and dialogue can occur in more sustained and intensive ways. There are no quick and easy solutions to this complex problem. There are major political and public relations aspects to this problem.

Two approaches to the problem of resources which might be considered are presented here. The first concerns the retraining and/or reassignment of

personnel presently based external to the school site with the intent of their assuming more responsibility at specific schools and assisting in evolving more coherent schemes for continuing teacher growth. The second is the development of more effective forms of inservice by attaching the need for more and better inservice to such highly visible and cross-cutting societal concerns as the improvement of basic literacy, the diminishment of multi-cultural insensitivities or greater opportunity for the many learners who are disadvantaged or handicapped in some manner. There must not only be a better marriage between inservice and curriculum development but curriculum which is of utmost concern to the general public.

This melding must occur with a good deal more aggressiveness and in some respects risk-taking than has commonly occurred to this point in time. The various role groups within the education profession must, in a united and forceful way, state what it will take in the way of time, expertise, and INSET resources to respond to certain expectations which currently appear largely unrealistic for the schools to accomplish. If, for example, schools are to in any way expand significantly upon their traditional role in providing for the cognitive development of students to better accommodate social and emotional growth, then it must be made very clear to those who support education what it will take in the way of resources and teacher education to meet such objectives. Likewise, if a teacher is expected to model such intrapersonal skills and attitudes as empathic listening, sustained one-to-one dialogue, and more attention to student feelings as well as understandings, then it must be shown more dramatically how difficult this is to do in a concept of schooling where teachers are engaged with 30 and more learners at any given time and where they have as many as 1,000 different verbal interactions with students in the course of a single day. School conditions have to change in many situations before teachers are able to change as well.

There are obviously some school districts where more support has been garnered than others. The inservice program in Lincoln, Nebraska, in the United States is one example of a district that has built up support for its program of inservice, much of which is school-focused in nature.

Lincoln is a medium-sized public school district in the South Central part of the United States. The coherent manner in which inservice is addressed in this district has presented a positive image to and attracted support from the school community. To begin with, each school in this decentralized system conducts its own needs assessment process. The specific school community in which the school resides is considered in this assessment as well as the characteristics of the student body and the present capabilities of the staff. These individual building needs are in turn reviewed and synthesized by central office personnel to form the basis of a district-wide INSET program for the school year. Each separate school staff then develops a program improvement plan/budget which is based both upon their own school's interest as well as those which cut across the school district. These inservice plans also take into account both individual and program improvements (curricular and organizational changes).

The Lincoln District employs a form of management-by-objectives to assist with staff appraisal. "Job targets" are developed at the beginning of each year for all employees in the district. Support for this program has been excellent even though it is comprehensive and intensive in nature. Teachers are involved in numerous ways in INSET activities. A teacher advisory committee meets regularly with the director of staff development and the local school board in determining not only priorities for inservice but also in deciding the type of support and resources that will be needed to conduct them effectively. Teachers are also involved in a collaborative way in evaluating all facets of staff development including attempts to assess the effect of inservice on student

achievement. Assessment of the effects of a program helps to generate support for it.

The Jefferson County approach to INSET as reported in the U.S. study also places a high priority on the continuing education of those who support and govern programs of INSET. Programs are offered not only for members of the local school community, but activities are designed specifically for the local school board which decides a good share of school policy and funding. One of the INSET priorities for board members is the maintenance of effective two-way communication with all employees and their professional organizations.

Leadership for Inservice. A fourth major problem is a general lack of leadership. There appears to be ample evidence that school-focused inservice to this point in time has been impoverished both quantitatively and qualitatively. Lack of quality school-focused INSET is attributable in many respects to the fact that generally no one person at the school site has either the responsibility or the competence to organize and manage forms of school-focused INSET. It is obvious that a considerable variety of persons do contribute to teacher inservice and program renewal; alterations in organization, curriculum and social context. However, as is reported throughout the INSET national case studies, these contributions usually are made in a fractionated manner and by persons whose primary responsibilities are external to the school site.

Our recent study of inservice in this country (Yarger, Howey, Joyce, 1979) further confirmed what other studies have shown and conventional wisdom has acknowledged--that inservice personnel largely removed from the school site are increasingly seen as dysfunctional by teachers. While building administrators such as principals or heads commonly have some responsibility for inservice, there is rather incontrovertible data, at least in this country, to testify to their limited impact on staff development to this point in time. Given the

number of other problems currently associated with many schools, which prin-
pals must attend to, one could infer that they would also be prohibited from extensive leadership in INSET in the near future as well.

The qualitative problem is attributable in many respects to the fact that many, if not most, of those persons who do assume some responsibility for school-focused INSET simply are not prepared to effect comprehensive and interrelated forms of inservice and program development. They are usually prepared as specialists to assist with specific problems such as one aspect of the school curriculum or one dimension of teaching behavior.

This writer embraces three assumptions about this leadership problem: (1) that more competent school-based teacher trainers or leaders (many of whom could be teachers themselves) could be selected and prepared; (2) that in many situations existing personnel resources in roles external to school sites would be better re-deployed to assume such roles, and (3) that programs for preparing persons to assume more effective school-focused roles can in fact be developed.

Consistent with these assumptions this writer has over the past fifteen months met with a group of experts from around the United States in an attempt to develop a framework and curricula for programs which would prepare persons for leadership roles at the school site. The training of trainers framework is grounded on the premise that leadership personnel at school sites should have some understanding of (1) adult growth and development, (2) organizational growth and development, specifically as it relates to schools, (3) curriculum development, and (4) general strategies for the coordination, management and delivery of inservice.

There are various disciplines which can be drawn upon in an interrelated way to better prepare persons for leadership roles at the school site. Suffice it to say that after rather comprehensive inquiry not a single training program could be identified in higher education in the United States which prepared

people for a leadership role in coordinated schemes of school-focused program and staff development. From this perspective this is a problem of paramount importance.

This leadership role for enhancing school-focused forms of inservice has been one of the areas of priority attention from the beginning in this CERI/OECD project. It was one of three major agenda items on the program at the 1978 international workshop on school-focused inservice held in Bournemouth, England. At this conference six global functions were identified for this school-focused inservice leader:

(a) the encouragement of self-development of teachers;

(b) training for new roles and responsibilities;

(c) updating in educational matters;

(d) guiding responses to change;

(e) providing solutions for job specific problems; and

(f) helping in the transition to fully professional status--a task which was greater than simply undertaking induction training. (1978, p. 9)

These global functions were evolved out of previous discussion of skills and attributes needed by INSET leaders or facilitators. At the 1976 conference on strategies for school-focused support structures held in Stockholm, Sweden, the qualities needed in this role were also discussed (See Conference Report, p. 19).

Various examples of leadership roles were shared in the various case studies. For example, one type of inservice activity which Forrest shares in his New Zealand report is a description of how "advisors" provide INSET support for teachers in rural schools. This is one model of school-focused teacher educators. The official function of the rural Advisor is described as "to help young and inexperienced teachers with school organization and methods of teaching." The

basic format employed by these Advisors is to rotate among the [illegible] schools in their given geographic region or "patch" and visit with beginning teachers. The length of the Advisor's visitation obviously depends upon the needs and interests of specific teachers. Generally visits are of one day duration but frequently span three successive days.

The Advisors hold to the premise that the degree to which they can be effectively utilized by teachers is dependent in many respects on the type of relationship they are able to develop with teachers. It is seen as essential that a teacher-colleague relationship is formed. Basic guidelines which the Advisor follows include listening sensitively to the teachers, demonstrating respect for the teacher's views and concern for the teacher's welfare. It is also imperative that the Advisors go beyond understanding the teacher's problems and concerns and demonstrate techniques and strategies which are seen as useful by the teachers. They cannot only talk about what to do.

It is also necessary that the Advisors establish good working relationships with decision-makers and administrators in these rural districts. In many respects the extent to which the Advisor is able to influence situations and be helpful to teachers is related to his personal/professional relationships with administrators and his ability to influence these people. Thus we have a portrait of an approach to inservice, where one periodically rotates through schools in the role of a colleague who is there to listen to problems and concerns. It is a person who is seen as having influence to make changes in the conditions in which teachers work as well. It is also a person who can bring to bear upon a problem the experiences of several teachers who are in similar situations.

The leadership role need not be assumed by a single person only. The first case study in the Australian report is referred to as "the project team approach." The essence of this strategy to school-focused inservice is the

formation of small teams composed of relatively young teachers who have demonstrated a capacity for curriculum organization and renewal in their own schools. These teachers are released from their own instructional duties for two to three years in order to work with teachers in other schools, when invited, for extended periods of time.

This idea came about as the result of inter-school visits which were quite frequent in Australia. In this scheme teachers traveled across the state to visit schools with an innovative reputation. However, since certain schools became increasingly popular for visits, a problem of disruption occurred in these schools. Thus, in trying to resolve the question of how the value of inter-school visits might be preserved without disruption, the idea of the teams evolved as an attempt to meet the desired objectives of exchange among teachers. In essence the visitation process was reversed. Now teachers were taken from the innovation situations to go to schools who desired information about this, rather than the other way around.

Ingvarson reports on two different team approaches, a mathematics project team, and what was referred to as the "access skills" project team. In the latter team, teachers were included from a range of subject disciplines at the post-primary level. Also included were teachers from the primary, secondary and technical schools. Thus different perspectives were brought together to work on common educational issues. This "access skills" team also incorporated a social worker and a welfare worker.

These project team approaches illustrate several concepts of school-focused INSET in addition to teachers working with teachers. These teachers were available for extended periods of time at the local school sites in response to specific and identified school needs. The efforts of the access skills team are especially intriguing. This team gave priority attention to requests for

support from schools that were long-term or at least part of an overall developmental program. The mathematics team was concerned primarily with the development and demonstration of materials. The access skills project team was determined to focus upon role and behavioral changes--the types of changes which Fullan reports rarely are dealt with in attempts at curriculum development.

Ingvarson suggests that there is no basis at this stage for offering prescriptions for how future teams might operate. In fact, he suggests a long-term task for such teams would be presumably to work themselves out of a job. He compares the project team approach somewhat to the notion of Havelock's "linkage-agent"--that is, people who could work in the middle between research and practice. However, where Havelock (1971) was concerned with the linkage between users (teachers) and resource systems such as research and development institutions, these project teams were more oriented to building linkages within and between schools and teachers. In each instance, he reports:

> The linkages have had as their main purpose the aim of helping individual schools know more of what other schools have been able to do when faced with similar problems. In this way they have made a very promising beginning and a distinctive contribution to developing ideas about school-focused inservice education. (1978, p. 24)

Often problems go unresolved for long periods of time because no one person has the responsibility for or takes basic initiative in resolving it. While the intent is not to propose a simple solution for the complex problems of inservice, there appears much truth to the above proposition relative to the lack of effective inservice at many school sites. At this point in time it appears that in the general majority of schools there is not the necessary leadership either in terms of energies or competence to begin to implement more coherent schemes of school-focused INSET. CERI/OECD, in their wisdom, have had study groups which have looked at both the problem of leadership for school-focused inservice and at the concept of adult development which is a

requisite understanding for these leaders if they are to succeed. Hopefully this work will lead to a better understanding of the variety and types of leadership roles which will allow for more effective inservice at the school site.

Improved Conceptualization of INSET. A fifth basic problem is the question or matter of "balance". Perhaps the most dominant issue which has been raised in the papers and reports sponsored by CERI/OECD has been how to achieve a balance between meeting individual teacher needs and larger cross-cutting concerns. This problem is related in many respects to the concepts of collaboration and autonomy. There is an obvious need, as has been pointed out in all of the reports and specifically in the New Zealand report, for more collaboration among the various agencies and agents who would purport to offer forms of continuing education. Federal and state agencies frequently intervene because broad societal concerns are not responsibly addressed in local situations. At the same time, there is also the concern that the idiosyncratic concerns of the local community and individual teacher autonomy as befits a professional are maintained. These are long-standing, universal tensions. Hopefully, however, a well-conceived and coherent approach to school-focused inservice would accommodate both the collective concern and the individual interest.

When addressing the question of balance, however, there are numerous other dimensions of INSET subsumed within these larger issues which must be attended to. Those who would plan and organize "balanced" inservice agendas of a school-focused nature must also attend to other concerns. As suggested earlier, INSET must be able to accommodate both unique personal interests and at the same time facilitate collegial cooperation and curricular and organizational renewal which cuts across teachers. School-focused inservice must also find better ways to tap into the myriad insights and potential of people within the

school setting and also bring in a variety of persons external to the site to insure new and alternative perspectives. School-focused INSET must not only be concerned that new ideas, materials, and approaches come into a school, but the focus must also be on refining and enriching the familiar. Inservice of the school-focused variety must not only respond to specific, immediate problems, but relate these to broader conceptual concerns and long-range agenda. School-focused inservice must focus not only upon the teacher in his or her role as a person who instructs students,

but on the roles of scholar, member of a profession and member of a school community. There is a real danger that inservice of a school-focused variety will become unnecessarily limited to immediate problems and attached only to the teaching role.

There must also be a balance in school-focused INSET activities between single intensive activities and ongoing developmental projects which continue over periods of weeks, months, and even years. There must be a balance of school-focused INSET between those activities which are conducted on-site and those which allow a teacher to remove themselves from the daily routine and to observe and experience other settings and other contexts in a reflective and introspective manner. There must be a balance in school-focused inservice between activities which are separate and apart from their actual teaching activities and those which can be integrated into on-going instructional responsibilites.

This balanced approach to school-focused INSET is reported in detail in the first New Zealand case study which outlines the experiences provided for teachers who have been out of service for more than three years. This approach is characterized by its emphasis on observation and actual practice of specific teaching behaviors. For example, a minimum of 75 hours of observation with selected teachers is required for these teachers before they are allowed to re-enter service. The practicing or cooperating teachers have the responsibility for providing the re-entering teacher with opportunities for observation 'in multiple aspects of new teaching techniques and curriculum development.' A balance of action and reflection is provided as stated earlier. This balance appears critical in INSET models which are concerned with the teacher's ability to internalize and conceptualize more complex approaches to teaching. While the opportunity to observe specific practices and practice specific techniques

would appear to be essential to the success of many inservice endeavors, data collected in surveys of inservice across several nations suggests that in reality there is a paucity of activities which provide for this.

The above are just some of the dimensions of what is referred to here as "balance" which must be considered in a well-conceived plan of school-focused inservice.

Cooperation and Coordination. Certainly a major problem, and one which has been reiterated throughout the case studies, is that of coordination and cooperation among the various agencies and role groups which have a vested interest in inservice. This author will again take the liberty of referring to the survey (Yarger, Howey, Joyce, 1979) in which he participated to underscore the seriousness of the problem. This study surveyed not only teachers, but administrators, members of the school community, and representatives of higher education as well. Each of these various role groups, when asked about the need for cooperation and collaboration, acknowledged the considerable importance of working together.

Each of these role groups, however, identified serious problems in achieving such cooperation, and reported only rare instances when they were able to engage in it. The respondents in the study were presented with a set of factors which might constrain against cooperation between different role groups and agencies relative to inservice. These included: lack of skill in cooperative decision-making, competition between role groups because of vested interests, inadequate guidelines or framework to guide cooperative activity, inadequate financial support to allow people to work together, and a situation of being too involved with their own priorities and their own situation to give the necessary time to cooperative effort. Each of the role groups surveyed identified each of the potential obstacles which were presented as in fact a big (or very big) problem from their personal experience.

The need for cooperation is also documented in the case studies. For example, Fullan in his report on school-focused INSET practices in Canada, notes in his introduction that education is basically the exclusive responsibility of each of the ten provinces in Canada which operate autonomously from the federal government. He notes that while there are strong differences among the provinces in some aspects of educational policy, there is remarkable commonality in the area of curriculum policy across the provinces. He describes INSET in most provinces as offered through a variety of agencies which include the Ministry of Education, university faculties of education, local school districts, and teacher federations among others. Fullan states that there is little integration of activities between these various agencies, as by and large INSET activities are conducted independently of one another.

Thus, again we have a problem with multiple dimensions to it and one which will not easily be resolved. It would appear that one has to look from a broad perspective at the spectrum of continuing education activities available and especially at the different purposes which they are intended to serve. The role and responsibility of various agencies and agents have to be critically examined relative to achieving those different purposes. This is no simple matter, but one cannot have a basically undifferentiated concept of inservice and reasonably expect to ascertain what role various parties should most reasonably assume in that process. (Thus in the next phase of this report we will look briefly at the role of various parties in school-focused INSET.)

Adequate Documentation and Evaluation

As Ingvarson stated earlier if this concept is not to sink to the status of another passing fad and if the monies and resources needed to develop more powerful forms of continuing education are to be forthcoming, then better documentation and evaluation are certainly needed. CERI/OECD has published several

papers that deal with evaluation and those reports are being synthesized elsewhere so the concern need not be discussed at length in this report. Some insight into the forms of evaluation seen as most consonant with school-focused INSET can be gained by reflecting on these summarizing comments in the report of the CERI/OECD International Workshop held at Bournemouth in 1978:

> The need for a wide ranging "illuminative" approach to the evaluation of school-focused INSET, as indicated in Eklund's paper, was accepted since it is concerned with diagnosis, process analysis, and outcome measurement. Views of evaluation as being simply responsive, deficiency oriented, and external to the teachers or schools and kept as the preserve of a few experts were rejected. Evaluation was agreed to be an essential component of school-focused INSET and the collaborative involvement of teachers was viewed as a basic premise. Therefore the group favored several moves to provide support structures which would assist teachers and others to become involved in evaluation more quickly and easily. (1978, p. 12)

While rigorous evaluation of inservice is rare, one of the better known efforts related to school-focused INSET is the Inservice Teacher Education Project (SITE) in England. This major evaluation project is centered in the School of Education at the University of Bristol, where Ray Bolam and Keith Baker are the primary investigators. The SITE project was established to explore the feasibility of individual schools being able to initiate workable policies for INSET. The emphasis in this study is on the school as a whole but also looks at functioning groups (departments, pastoral teams, etc.) and individual teachers within the school. The investigators are especially concerned with the theory and management of innovation not only at the school level but also at the district and providing agency levels. In order to assess the capacity of schools to develop their own priorities for INSET and eventually implement them, a variety of evaluation strategies are employed.

This project at the Bristol School of Education represents the latest phase in a continuing program concerned with the theory and practice of innovation and professional development in education. At this time, approximately

50 schools are involved in this effort. The specific aims of the project are stated as follows:

a. to explore the practicality of providing a relatively concentrated programme of inservice activities in response to school-formulated statements of needs.

b. to ascertain the effects, implications, and generalizability of this process for teachers, departments, schools, providing agencies and LEAs.

c. to explore the potential of INSET activities which take place on-site; i.e., on the school premises. (1979, project outline)

Each school which is participating in this study is analyzing its INSET needs at three levels; the individual teacher, department, and total school. Each participating school has set up its own planning arrangements, to develop one year plans of INSET. Internal coordinators have been designated to spear-head these programs. The specific scope and content of each program is decided by the staffs at each school site. They have the ultimate decision as to whether or not to invite the participation of external agents and agencies and how they will involve them if they do.

The action research employed in this project demands that the research designs which are finally evolved and the evaluation methods and instruments which are employed will depend upon the particular INSET program agreed upon by the participants. The overall evaluation design, however, has three major strands. The first is a continuous monitoring of the processes by which the program is devised, negotiated, and implemented at school, LEA and Center levels. The second are evaluations of the INSET program as a whole. And the third are evaluations of specific activities within that program. A variety of methods including formal and informal interviews, direct observation, document study, questionnaires and attitude surveys are employed in these various case studies.

In the initial phase of this project, faculty in the participating schools have been engaged for the most part in determining their INSET needs and this process of needs analysis has been difficult in many situations. Discussions

frequently have been protracted and have not always led to tangible INSET proposals. Thus, there has been concern over the type and variety of support which might be provided for schools or groups of teachers experiencing difficulties in this problem diagnosis.

TOWARDS A RESOLUTION OF THE PROBLEMS

Role of Teachers. There appears to be no debate in any of the case studies with the need for more involvement of teachers in all facets of INSET, including planning, implementation and evaluation. Certainly such involvement must extend beyond the too-frequent practice (at least in this country) of asking teachers to rank order topics which they perceive as most important or interesting to them in terms of an inservice activity under the label of "needs assessment." A few words are in order here about assessment. A coherent and comprehensive assessment would involve several assessment techniques and diagnostic tools. From this perspective a comprehensive assessment would include measures of the social maturity and developmental stage of the organization (school) on the one hand, and periodic assessment of individual psychological needs which impinge upon professional growth on the other. A comprehensive needs assessment will also look at such critical questions as when and where, for how long, and with whom, the inservice activities will be pursued, as well as what their content will be. Hopefully more involved teacher discussion of ways in which inservice might occur, will result in more efforts to alter the environment of the school to accommodate inservice in more natural and ongoing ways and inservice increasingly will not be seen as something separate and apart from the daily world of the school.

There are at least two major types of inservice which teachers must decide about. This writer is reminded of his original experience in the design and

development of a teaching center. In this center there was a three-tiered governance structure. At one level the authorized legal heads of two systems (a local education agency and an institution of higher education) met to identify matters of mutual interest and concern in their respective systems. This procedure insured that the formalized leadership in each of these systems would meet on a continuing basis. At a second level, teachers were equally involved along with community representatives and faculty members of the institution of higher education. They looked at those problems and concerns which were programmatic in nature. These types of issues tended to permeate a school site and frequently had implications for the community as well. This decision-making body had control over a sum of money which was designated only for activities of a collective or programmatic nature. Finally, a third body was composed primarily of teachers and they concerned themselves with support and resources for individual and small group teacher activities. On this body there was only nominal representation from the community and higher education. Likely, even this structure is too simplistic to adequately respond to the different purposes and needs addressed in inservice.

The various case studies provide multiple examples of teacher involvement. One aspect of the New Zealand report examines local inservice training provided for secondary school teachers in the Auckland Region. Inservice training in this area is largely organized by local area inservice committess. (Auckland is divided into seven basic regions with each region containing between 11 and 18 secondary schools.) A committee coordinates INSET for each of these regions and a central controlling committee in turn coordinates the work of each of these regional committees. Teachers themselves assume a major responsibility in these committees. Each regional committee is provided with general guidelines, but has some degree of flexibility in terms of how it operates. Every state and

private school in the region elects one staff representative to the local in-service committee. In addition, each of the committees is represented by two inspectors and one secondary teachers' college representative.

Not only do these committees decide on the content and substance of courses by inventorying the various representatives on the committees, but they determine who would be most effective as instructors from their knowledge of the various teachers in the region as well. It is not uncommon for a committee to run some fifteen courses per year in responses to various school requests. Forrest reports that:

> This course (format) presents an ideal opportunity for workshop groups of specialist (secondary) teachers to devise a series of units of work which can be pooled and so form the nucleus of a more detailed scheme of work. (1979, draft copy)

Thus it appears that a reasonable scheme has been devised to bring together teachers of similar interest and training to work on problems of mutual concern. School-focused inservice in this scheme stresses teacher involvement. Leadership is provided from within their own ranks and opportunities for sharing are stressed. The sharing is of such a nature that projects can be cumulative and developmental in nature, a process frequently lacking in many inservice efforts.

Another INSET scheme shared in the New Zealand report are those activities coordinated in the Walters House, which is a full-time, non-residential inservice training centre. Teachers again assume a major role here. This Centre has been operated by the Auckland Education Board for over 20 years now. It is governed by a committee of members of the Auckland Primary Inspectorate. Forrest reports that this centre has traditionally fulfilled an important role in providing impetus for curriculum implementation and development. It attempts to preserve a balance among activities which are designed to (1) maintain progress in a particular subject, (2) develop innovative approaches, and (3) deepen the professional understanding of more experienced teachers.

This centre employs a unique approach in terms of providing assistance to schools. The first course offered at the centre each year is attended by teachers who in turn become relieving or resource teachers for the next group of teachers from other schools who will attend sessions at Walters House. In this way the school can receive a double benefit. First, there is the opportunity for a faculty member to attend the special session at Walters House, and second it has the services of an experienced teacher who has also received recent training as well while their own faculty member is in training. Walters House well illustrates the concern in school-focused inservice for intensive periods of time away from the usual routine and also the need to bring new perspectives into a school. The usual course or inservice activity offered at the centre is from three to four weeks in duration. In addition, many of the courses are preceded by orientation meetings and followed up by one or more recall meetings where participants can reinforce their knowledge and exchange how they were able to incorporate ideas gained into practice.

Teacher involvement is built into all facets of INSET planning in several of the situations reported in the U.S. Case Study. In Montgomery County, for example, teachers are commonly employed as instructors in the "Teacher Competency Series" which is a developmental set of training activities which focus on the specific skills central to a teacher's role. The teachers who serve as instructors are selected on the basis of their participation in previous INSET activities, the quality of their instructional program with students and on the advice and feedback provided by supervisors. In addition these teachers are paired with experienced instructors for a minimum of one course offering before they are given responsibility for the further education of their peers.

It does, however, appear critical to at least differentiate between those individual needs of the teacher and those which are most reflective of system

and/or community priorities. It would also seem that the degree of [illegible] involvement relative to these two different needs would vary. Certainly the ultimate responsibility for the continuing growth of teachers rests with the teacher, but it is not solely their responsibility. What is imperative to advancing teacher learning or INSET is a collective attitude which underscores that the teacher is a scholar, an experimenter, a researcher, if you will. Such an attitude seems sorely lacking at least in this country, at the present time.

This experimental role of the teacher needs to be emphasized and embedded more in their job. Examples of such experimentation include collegial, student-shared, or self-observations of specific approaches to teaching. This writer has been involved in a number of small experiments where students in the classroom have been involved in systematically examining dimensions of commom classroom activity along with their teachers. These include such basic phenomena as the verbal interaction patterns in the classroom, various types of group behavior which occur, the way decisions are made, and the roles and responsibilities of a learner. Job-embedded forms of inservice allow for documenting and evaluating various aspects of classroom activity.

These forms of inservice can often involve periodic, negotiated, self-improvement contracts between the teacher and his or her immediate supervisor. Such contracts should ideally be two-way in nature and identify reciprocal responsibilities for the head or principal in terms of their accountability for the resources-materials and support necessary for the teacher to engage in exploration into new areas. It is obvious that such job-embedded approaches are at one and the same time most appealing and of considerable concern. They have the great advantage of being able to focus directly on the ultimate objectives of INSET, that is, actual teacher and student behavior as it relates to desired outcomes. At the same time it is the very scrutiny of such behavior that creates tension and fears on the part of many.

The Role of the Professional Teacher Organizations. While this writer is limited in many respects in being able to address this topic (nor was it discussed in any detail within the case studies), there does appear to be rather obvious implications for professional teacher organizations relative to advancing INSET. Certainly one priority as just reviewed should be promoting the teachers themselves more actively as scholars and inquirers into the nature of schools, the nature of teaching, and the nature of how children continue to develop and learn. Teachers cannot continue to be seen as the repository of data gathered in research and development done by others. There is no intent to overstate their role or to present too idealized a notion here. The demands of teaching are considerable and certainly there will always be a need for competent researchers other than classroom teachers to engage in scholarly inquiry. Hopefully there will be increased instances of collaboration between those in higher education and research centers and those in the schools in research ventures. There does seem to be some movement in this direction.

What seems critical, though, is that all teachers see their classroom as a laboratory where experimentation with new techniques should naturally occur. The professional organization could greatly advance such an attitude by making such activity a central theme in their meetings and publications. Professional teacher organizations are too often viewed as preoccupied with the advancement of teacher wages and working conditions. The professional status of teachers has to be a more visible concern, both to the general community and to teachers themselves. Teacher organizations would seem one logical group to assume more initiative here.

Role of the Building Administrator. There are considerable differences from country to country in terms of how schools are administered. When, however, there is a head or principal who has basically non-teaching responsibilities,

that role especially appears to be in need of re-examination relative to INSET. It was the collective opinion at the CERI/OECD international workshop in Palm Beach that as critical as the role of these administrators is, they are unlikely to assume much of a "master teacher" function themselves. Certainly there is a need for effective administrators. Some of the problems in schools today can be attributed to some degree to inadequate management or administration. School/community relationships are increasingly important, yet often relationships between schools and their various communities are not what they should be. The resolution to this problem calls for among other things vigorous and effective administrative leadership.

Likewise the job-embedded forms of inservice briefly outlined earlier commonly call for more flexible staffing arrangements and collaboration among teachers--a major challenge for school administrators. Lead teacher or team leader roles of a variety of types need to be developed which will better facilitate joint teacher diagnosis and planning, and more collegial observation and sharing of actual teaching and instructional techniques. The essence of this concept are highly qualified professionals working closely together.

Unfortunately, such arrangements are just not common. It would appear that one key to differentiated staffing and collaborative problem-solving in many respects is the building administrator. They can also help ensure the conditions necessary for putting the concept of teaching in a more experimental context. They can assume major leadership for making schools more centers of inquiry. This can work with faculty to create more fluid staffing patterns and delegate and develop several types of leadership roles for teachers. The continuing education or re-education of principals is a corollary--if not a prerequisite--condition to the achievement of sustained forms of well-conceived programs of school-focused INSET.

All of the case studies speak to the critical role of the principal in school-focused forms of inservice. For example, in the description of the first INSET practice in his Canadian Case Study, Fullan reports on a medium-sized urban school district and its efforts to provide a coherent scheme of inservice. He reminds us that most school districts in Canada are very concerned about the implementation of Provincial curriculum guidelines since it is within these guidelines that priorities are in turn set for specific districts. Frequently a tension develops between accomplishing district-wide priorities and individual school or teacher priorities which at times are not congruent with the broader emphasis. Fullan points out in his review how this district confronts this problem and coordinates monies from a variety of sources to support inservice. Included in this fiscal scheme is a teacher's association/school board joint professional development fund. Each group contributes $14 per teacher annually to this fund. The fund is administered by the teacher's association with input by the superintendent's office.

Unlike the other examples shared in the Canadian Report, it is emphasized that the principal assumes a key role here in this scheme for planning and coordinating inservice activities at both the district and school level. Emphasis is on the individual school as the unit of change. Schools, while required to accept broad district priorities, are encouraged to set their own procedures for accommodating these, and the principal assumes the key role in assuring that both priorities are met.

Other characteristics of this district approach reported in the Canadian Case Study include strong district support for INSET. The board, the superintendent, and the director of instruction are all integrally involved in supporting a coherent program of INSET. The inservice project also has a distinct curriculum focus, and appears as a result to be effective in developing specific forms of inservice in to a developmental scheme. The majority of persons

employed in providing INSET instruction come from personnel within the district; teachers are widely used. Finally, this broad approach to inservice is based upon an overall plan which organizes and integrates the various activities in a scheme which allows for follow-through and continuity.

In one of the Australian studies the principal of a kindergarten to lower secondary school in Melbourne involved a relatively large number of external consultants (24) into the ongoing school activities for a week's time. These consultants worked with both teachers and students in demonstrating new techniques and ideas.

The principal who was the primary organizer of the experiment reports:

> Our experience suggests that there are some advantages in an extensive piece of work like this, in that it creates an atmosphere of experimentation which stimulates ideas about new teaching styles....One of the really impressive aspects of the week was the way in which students responded to the creative opportunities. A willingness to enter into new approaches, to throw themselves into imaginative activity, was readily apparent. (1978, p. 35)

Thus in case study two of the Australian Report we have an excellent example of a principal facilitating intensive intervention. Another unique characteristic of this case study was the involvement of students in inservice that was directly related to the school curriculum. It is an example of what this writer has repeatedly referred to as job-embedded inservice--a form of inservice which in fact can be integrated into the ongoing daily activity of the school. This example illustrates that many school-focused approaches call for considerable planning and organization as well as follow-up if they are to be productive and the role of the principal in such matters is often a critical one.

The Role of the Community. Certainly the precise role of the community in helping to decide about matters of any type at the local school level, let alone inservice, is unclear. Most countries outlined some role for the community,

in some cases a substantive one. For example, in Australia there seems a considerable commitment at the federal level to grass roots community involvement in inservice at the school level. The efforts in Australia are largely just beginning, and while the data reported is limited, some promising results have been achieved. The United States has not moved far in this direction but one fairly large study is worth mentioning here.

This author had the good fortune to have been involved in the evaluation of the federally-sponsored Urban/Rural School Development Project. This was a six-year federal government experiment aimed at improving education in economically deprived communities. In this program, 25 school sites around the United States were identified which were considerably impoverished either in remote rural areas or within the core of larger urban areas. Money was awarded to specific schools and clusters of schools, which was to be spent for personal development programs (INSET) with the hope of promoting more sensitivity and competence in the teaching staff, especially in relation to the needs of the local community. Decisions about how money was to be spent at these local school and school cluster sites were made by what was called a school/community council. Both the education professionals and the community were equally represented on these councils. They were provided assistance in a variety of ways on how to increase their competence in working together and in making joint decisions.

The meetings of the school-community councils were systematically observed over time and data collected about the types of decisions made and the impact of those decisions. In the final evaluation on this, the following main conclusions were identified:

(1) School-community councils, with approximately equal representation of school officials--mainly teachers--and community people, can be established and can achieve parity in structure and operation in making decisions about inservice education.

(2) The work of such councils, through shared decision [illegible] the main parties affected, has a positive effect on morale in the district; improves the variety, quantity, and quality of inservice education; and, where the evidence is available, leads to better learning of students.

(3) The communities, after six years, and with the end of federal support, are trying to carry on and to incorporate the experimental work into the regular school programs. For instance, the results of Urban/Rural are being used to help shape new federal programs (notably the 1978 five-year cycle of Teacher Corps and the Teacher Centers Program) and significant state legislation (notably California's new Comprehensive School Improvement Program). (Joyce, 1978, XII).

These positive results did not occur overnight and without struggle; the results were not always even. Losses followed gains. Some communities were more successful than others. No one model evolved from the Urban/Rural program that is a panacea for overcoming poverty and the many ills that beset the school. The experiment did demonstrate that disenfranchised poor people can be given a larger voice in how their schools are run with favorable results. School-focused inservice by its very definition, would seem to call for the involvement of community as well as teachers, and the limited data that we have to this point in time suggests that such a concept indeed has merit and deserves more attention. Research on community involvement in Australia also supports the concept generally but it too ~~raises~~ unanswered questions.

A study of the school planning conferences over a three-year period is reported. These are school-focused meetings which involve parents and community as well as teachers. Ingvarson concludes that while the idea of greater community involvement is not argued, the effectiveness of the school planning conferences is not altogether clear at this time. The participation of parents and members of the community appears somewhat related to the theme as well as the format selected for school planning conferences. However, it appears at this time that neither the degree of preplanning for the conference, the extent of publicity, nor even the amenability of the theme can be cited as major

contributory factors to how extensive community participation is in these INSET activities. Ingvarson reports:

> It is unfortunate that evaluation for the school planning conference has not been carried to the point where the conditions for its success/failure have been adequately identified; nor has the vexing question of the circumstances necessary for effective community participation been resolved. (1978, p. 48)

In addition to the impetus provided by the KARMEL report for the Australian Schools Commission in 1973, parent and community involvement was further reinforced in Victoria by the Education Act of 1975. This latter act provided a basis for extending parent and student involvement in the formulation of school policies. Regulations within this act provided for more representation for parents and students in the governance of secondary schools. They could now be involved in deciding about the spending of the maintenance grant, the appointment of ancillary staff, and also acquired the right to offer advice on general educational policy.

In Victoria, inservice or development funds are administered by a central committee, the Victorian Inservice Education Committee (VISEC). This central committee is further decentralized into regional inservice education committees. In 1976 the VISEC decided to appoint a qualified person to facilitate parent and broader community participation in INSET. The Australian case study provides basically a narrative of the activities of a new prototypic role, that of an inservice adviser for parent and community in the State of Victoria. Especially provocative are the reports by this person of her efforts to develop networks of parents in local school areas. This inservice advisor reports that the nature of the project is based upon the following propositions: (1) the development of parent confidence and competence has to be systematically planned; (2) the implementation of programs directed toward this end must be designed so that they engage the participating parents from the <u>beginning</u> in the

administration and organizational aspects of the program; (3) financial costs associated with parent involvement in schools, such as child care and travel, must be acknowledged if parents are to be responsible for assisting other parents; and (4) the major concern of parents is to be involved effectively in decision-making about the education of their children.

The inservice advisor also reports upon the role and responsibility of members of the community within education/teacher centers. She sees education centers as having the unique quality of being on "neutral ground." That is, they are places where people can come together on equal footing, whether parent or professional. The person contributing to this part of the Australian case study readily acknowledges the difficulties involved in achieving good school-community interaction, notwithstanding its potential for greater responsiveness by the school to local needs. She closes this section of the Australian report in what appears to be a fairly generalizable statement about community involvement:

> But it is a difficult process we are involved in--attitude change is complex, and in the face of 100 years of centralism in hierarchical authority patterns, to develop a cooperative model of a school community of parents, teachers, and students with respect and concern for each other requires sensitivity, determination, and persuasiveness. But we know from our experience that schools which can develop these attitudes are good places to grow up in. (1978, p. 81)

The Role of Higher Education. Institutions of higher education vary with respect to size and purpose as much as schools do. For example, in the United States there are over 1300 institutions which prepare teachers, ranging from the small one and two faculty private college which prepares beginning teachers to the large colleges of education with a "knowledge-production" responsibility in multiversity settings. Thus it is difficult to generalize within countries, let alone across cultures, about the role of higher education relative to INSET generally and school-focus varieties specifically. Nonetheless, there appear to be

at least two or three ways institutions of higher education could provide rather invaluable assistance at this point in time.

First of all, there are direct implications for what is done in inservice as a result of the kinds of efforts and activities which occur in initial teacher education and during a formalized induction period, if indeed there is one. In an attempt to demonstrate the relationship between different phases of teacher education, this writer conjectured:

> . . . In this respect inservice can be seen as symptomatic. For example, if a highly select group of persons were rigorously screened and engaged in extensive preservice training, capped by an internship paralleling that received in medical preparation. . . and--if placement was a finely-tuned process of matching the highly specialized professional to a specific position. . . and, if the teaching role called for a sophisticated but reasonable range of skills, and, if working conditions reflected the latest in technology, materials, and resources, as behooves a society's responsibility to it's schools, then what would be the nature of inservice? (Howey, 1976, p. 105).

Certainly what is done in initial training has direct implications for what occurs later in a teacher's career relative to INSET. Throughout this report, this writer and the other case study writers' comments he has attempted to synthesize, have called for a more fluid and cooperative type of staffing within schools. Those in higher education largely responsible for initial training might begin to pilot initial training models where there is more cooperation between teachers working in teams and between teachers and preservice administrators, counselors and the like. Likewise the concept of the teacher as a scholar or the teacher as institution-builder could receive much greater emphasis in initial phases of teacher education as well. Little is done at the current time, at least in this country, with respect to creating an attitude toward and competence in asking questions, formulating research hypotheses and collecting data in an action research format. Little

is done in giving teachers skills in making instructional decisions together. Neither does the beginning teacher education curriculum reflect efforts to assist teachers in gaining understandings of their community or working with parents as partners in the education of their children. The point is obvious. The way teachers are prepared initially has considerable implication for the kind and nature of continuing education which will occur later. The relationship between pre and inservice needs much greater scrutiny.

A second major role for those in higher education would be to assist in preparing persons for 'resident' leadership roles at a school or clusters of schools as spoken to earlier. The graduate programs at many colleges and schools of education, especially in major universities include such separate fields of study as: curriculum design, instructional systems, evaluation, organizational development, social systems, counseling, and research on teaching. It would seem that a number of prototype programs for preparing leaders at school sites could be fashioned which would be of an interdisciplinary nature, drawing upon those topics of study indentified above. It would not seem that arduous an organizational and conceptual chore to develop such programs which would certainly address a basic need. Whatever design various programs might take, it would seem that a variety of different individual needs and interests could be accommodated. The primary need at the present time is to develop some prototypes for preparing more effective INSET leaders at school sites. Certainly higher education can play a central role in this respect.

A third basic tact which might be taken in facilitating school-focused INSET would be for faculties in institutions of higher education to work with selected 'lighthouse' school sites. This is hardly a new concept, and has been

implemented in various ways to various degrees in different countries. One common plan is to have selected faculty from the institutions of higher education assigned to a selected school site for a specified period of time, along with a fair sized cadre of beginning teachers. The beginning teachers are utilized to provide greater flexibility among the experienced staff in pursuing various forms of INSET, and in moving toward a more viable concept of the school as a center of inquiry. Efforts are made to hold up these schools for others to observe and learn about advancements made relative to INSET. Because of limited personnel resources, the institution of higher education often move to deploying members of their faculty to different schools for different purposes, in the next cycle of such a scheme.

There are many other roles of a cooperative nature an institution of higher education can assume. The second INSET program shared in the Canadian report represents a collaborative effort between a local district and a central institution of education, which is part of a university. The primary aim of this INSET endeavor is to improve classroom practice and student performance through the implementation of provincial guidelines. The program is essentially a master's inservice program in curriculum management and implementation. However, rather than employing the normative university-based model (i.e., college-based courses) this specific effort has been designed from "the problem up." Program activities are classroom and school oriented or focused and the format of activities are described as flexible, diverse, and field-based. The program is offered through regional field centers, which are attached to the Institute of Education. Individualized effort, as well as field-based workshops and seminars, comprise the program in which the participants eventually receive Master of Education credit.

This program in INSET focuses on organizational as well as individual development, as it is concerned not only with individual classroom practice but also needed competence at the district and regional level to implement curriculum guidelines.

Certainly the situation described is relatively unique, in that the inservice activities involve an analysis of intended student outcomes. That is, this inservice scheme called for a description of plausible levels of student performance and the development of a theoretically derived and empirically tested teaching methodology which would contribute to that desired performance. A variety of data-gathering procedures are employed by teachers in attempts to assess the effect of the teaching methodologies designed to impact specific student performance.

In this scheme then the external academic institute of higher education assumes the role of assisting teachers in the conceptualization of the nature and growth aspects of desired student outcomes. It also helps them to develop and field test teaching technologies for accomplishing these outcomes. The primary role of the teachers is to collaborate in identifying the specific outcomes of importance to them, and the types of practical teaching approaches which they believe will help achieve these desired ends.

Some of the most notable school-focused characteristics of this activity include the resident activities of academic staff at school sites, and the collegial and collaborative efforts in developing both group and individual forms of INSET. Likewise the program is cumulative in that it is not comprised of a series of independent courses but rather consists of a coherent program which attempts to relate a variety of different experiences over time, many of which are individual in nature. There is also a continuing attempt to integrate theoretical premises with procedural know-how.

Fullan in conclusion also notes some cautions relative to the program. It is basically a regional rather than an individual school approach to INSET. It is not clear to what extent, if any, the school as an organization is taken into account. Likewise the critical role of the principal which was so evident in the first case study he shared, is unclear in this approach. A great amount of the support and momentum in this INSET scheme is dependent upon the presence of an external academic agency. Fullan raises the central question of the feasibility of this arrangement to other situations. He notes:

> On the one hand, the vast majority of university faculties of education have not yet been able to provide the resources or competencies to work in such a sustained field-based way with local districts. On the other hand, nearly all faculties of education in Canada in the context of declining preservice enrollment are setting greater involvement in INSET as a priority (1979, p. 46).

Certainly there are other non field-based or school-focused roles which higher education can reasonably assume as well in advancing the state of the art of inservice. CERI/OECD has, for example, examined distance and correspondence approaches which effectively contribute to INSET. Likewise, various individuals from institutions of higher education will continue to be called upon in a variety of ways to assist with local programs of inservice. Hopefully, however, there will be an institutional commitment from more institutions of higher education to inservice of a school-focused variety as well. In summary these would include: 1) reconceptualizing the role of the teacher at the very outset of teacher education (relative to enhancing their abilities and opportunities to learn in a continuing way), 2) assisting in the preparation of leaders which can facilitate more coherent and well-conceived plans of INSET at school sites, and 3) expending energies in a 'critical mass' strategy to pilot a variety of school-focused approaches.

The Role of State and Federal Governments. It would be presumptuous here to attempt in any detail to delineate responsibilities for the governments of different countries at national and intermediate levels. Suffice it to say, it appears that there is considerable need for greater financial support of INSET in most countries. It would seem helpful to have, as is the case in some countries, a bureau at both federal and intermediate levels which attempts to coordinate INSET needs as they are derived from a variety of curricular efforts and special client needs (such as the handicapped). A common perspective is that a great many federal and intermediate interventions occur basically independent one of the other. A persuasive case can be made for a generic inservice agency which would examine staff development concerns across different bureaus and curriculum efforts.

In the United States at this time the majority of federal monies for educational improvement and innovation in schools come from Title IV grants in The Elementary and Secondary Act which flow through state departments of education. In 1978 an educational amendment was passed that requires each of the 50 states to develop "a comprehensive plan for the coordination of Federal and State funds for training activities for educational personnel." Thus major legislation which addresses this problem of coordination has been passed. The various agents and agencies concerned with the education of teachers are now involved in examining what the teacher education aspects of various types of different funding are and how these can be best related.

One other rather obvious need which might be addressed by the government is bringing together the several different role groups and agencies with a vested interest around common problems and issues in both beginning and continuing teacher education. Higher levels of government could reserve

nonies for financing INSET which were dependent upon the collaborative involvement of higher education, professional organizations, and local education agencies.

TEACHER CENTERS

Introduction

There is little doubt that teacher or teachers' centers (the former term will be employed here) have contributed to inservice practice which is frequently school-focused in nature. Since the growth of these centers is so pervasive and the term "teacher center" in fact is more common than that of school-focused inservice, the concept is briefly reviewed here.

This writer will not attempt any definitive or consensual definition of teacher centers. It is readily apparent from the literature that there is considerable diversity not only between countries and cultures but within countries in terms of those structures and operations which are referred to as teacher centers. A more feasible task is to summarize here some of the more common characteristics found in operations referred to as teacher centers and which are presented in a few case-studies sponsored by CERI. This writer will rely primarily on the expertise of L.C. Taylor, Head of Educational Programme Services at the Independent Broadcasting Authority in England and Sam J. Yarger of Syracuse University in the United States in Compiling this list of characteristics.

Both of these scholars have had considerable experience with teacher centers.

Taylor (1979) employs a familiar analog, that of "subject-centered" and "child-centered" forms of curriculum, as a way of thinking about teacher centers. The emphasis is on "teacher-centered" as opposed to subject-centered forms of INSET. Programs are based on needs and interests as perceived and

identified by teachers themselves. Centers are often distinguished by their emphasis on democratic and "grass roots" forms of participation. Teachers are not only involved in the identification of needs and interests but are also highly involved in the planning and conduct of INSET as well. Taylor also notes that centers are commonly characterized by their informality and frequently emphasize learning through practical or "hands-on" learning. Centers frequently provide attention to social as well as academic needs.

Devaney, in the paper she prepared for OECD/CERI on the role of teachers' centers in the United States relative to school-focused INSET, characterized them as follows:

> Over the past ten years a nationwide group of American educators has developed the idea of a small, informal, sometimes independent, sometimes school-district-sponsored work place where elementary teachers come, on their own initiative, to work on curriculum for their own classrooms. They work with the help of practical-minded professors or master teachers and with each other, largely in the spirit of colleagues exchanging rather than experts training.
>
> Such programmes are <u>places</u> where teachers come to work together, receive instruction, or share self-instruction, but they also may be a <u>staff of advisors</u>, who go out to help teachers in their schools, working in the spirit of finding teachers' own starting points for improvement. A number of characteristics make these organizations different from conventional inservice programmes:
>
> (i) They offer teachers fresh curriculum materials and/or lesson ideas, emphasizing active, exploratory, frequently individualized classroom work--not textbook and workbook study.
>
> (ii) These programmes engage teachers in making their own curriculum materials, building classroom apparatus, or involve them in some entirely new learning pursuit of their own so as to reacquaint them with the experience of being active, exploratory learners themselves.
>
> (iii) Teachers' centre instructors are themselves classroom teachers, sharing their own practical, classroom-developed materials; or they are advisors--formerly classroom teachers--who view their job as stimulating, supporting, and extending a teacher in her own directions of growth, not implementing a new instructional model or strategy.

(iv) Attendance at teachers' centre classes is voluntary, not prescribed by the school district, or if indirectly required (for instance, as a way to spend release time or to earn advancement credits), programmes offered are based on teachers' expressions of their own training needs, and several choices are offered. (1978, pp. 1,2).

Yarger (1979) in correspondence with this writer has identified the following eight characteristics which would seem, from his perspective, to distinguish American forms of Teachers' Centers. He differs somewhat from Devaney. The features which he most commonly identified in his research of centers in the United States are as follows:

1. They are often governed collaboratively with greater amounts of input from classroom teachers than is typically found in a non-teacher center program.
2. They usually have a "place," sometimes an entire building—but often a group of rooms where training and materials development can occur.
3. Teachers are clearly the primary clients, although other types of education personnel often participate.
4. They are devised to serve institutional needs as well as individual needs, and in rare occasions even both.
5. Programs typically emphasize the improvement of teaching skills and the development of curriculum materials.
6. There appears to be a tendency for less formal instruction with the sharing of participant expertise occurring frequently (although there can be considerable input from outside consultants as well).
7. Persons responsible for teacher centers are usually highly motivated and possess a recognizable "esprit de corps."

8. Funding is often tentative and short-range--teacher centers frequently live from hand to mouth, from day to day.

Reasons for the evolution of teacher centers are numerous and undoubtedly vary from country to country to some degree. It is quite apparent, however, that in many situations a dominant catalyst for the evolution of the centers is a growing desire on the part of teachers to have the preeminent voice in matters of their own continuing development. A number of factors have apparently confluenced in recent times to assist teachers in achieving this goal. The relative ineffectiveness of many curriculum and inservice efforts engineered by external agents for example has underscored the need for more teacher involvement in attempts to improve schools. Changes in many societies have resulted in a diminishment of more traditional authority, and this has also enhanced the position of teachers relative to their professional development. In the final analysis, reasons for the spread of teacher centers and teacher involvement include sound pedagogical thinking in terms of maximizing the participation of the learner (teacher), political agendas intended to achieve more power and status for what in many situations has been a maligned profession, and personal choice based upon the desire for a more convenient and comfortable form of continuing development.

While many teacher centers are school-focused in nature, others are not. It is difficult to generalize, but the differences between some teachers' centers and other forms of inservice which are specifically school-focused would include the following:

1. The primary focus in most teacher centers, quite obviously, is on teachers; while many school-focused inservice endeavors tend to attend to the needs of all educational and educationally-related personnel in a school building.

2. The focus in many teachers' centers tends to be more on individual teacher needs and interests, while in many school-focused endeavors there is at least some attention to problems which are best attended to by the entire faculty or close working groups within that faculty.

3. Many teacher centers have a district or regional focus; they attend to the needs of a number of schools. Other forms of school focused-inservice concentrate their energies more directly on individual schools.

4. There is an effort in many teacher centers to develop better linkages and coordination between and among the plethora of agents and agencies which are to some extent involved in the continuing education of teachers. In other forms of school-focused inservice a variety of persons external to the school are called upon, but the primary goal is to attend to the needs of the individual school and not serve as a coordinating agency.

It should be noted that federal legislation has been passed in different countries to support various forms of teacher or teachers' centers. One of the countries which most recently passed legislation and provided funds at the federal level to support teacher centers was the United States.

Toward a Definition

Taylor (1979) in an unpublished paper on teacher centers cautions that one should not exaggerate the "teacher-centered" nature of these inservice operations. A primary concern with the self-perceived needs of teachers, should not be mistaken for an exclusive preoccupation. He argues that a center can no more be uniformally or continually "teacher-centered" than a classroom can be constantly child-centered or the results will border on chaos. Taylor also notes that while teacher centers appear to be growing at least in terms of numbers in many countries, this general approach to INSET is hardly unique. There has been for some time and in many situations,

a variety of efforts to make inservice more responsive to teachers, continuing in nature and participatory in format.

These efforts have eminated from a variety of sources. For example, in many countries Taylor notes that a central or national institution has been able to develop this form of inservice. Examples of this would be the Swedish Ministries' DELTA AND JET inservice courses designed to assist teachers in modern mathematics and English. Other examples would be the Danish Teacher University, the Tubingen University in West Germany and the Open University in England. In each of these situations INSET reflects those characteristics often found in activities sponsered by teacher centers.

Taylor goes on to illustrate how some inservice concerns addressed by teacher centers are also addressed by several other agencies at a variety of levels. He identifies a brief typology of seven sources of inservice and examines both the ultimate initiative and control for the inservice they provide as well as the day by day or operational control. His brief typology (1979) is included below to illustrate the several sources from which in-service of a more participatory or school-focused nature may eminate.

		Ultimate Initiative and Control	Operational Initiative and Control
1.	Centrally based	Central Institution	Central Officials
2.	Centre-and-Branch based	Central Institution	Officials activating local branches
3.	Local Authority or Institution, and teacher	Local Authority Local Institution	Institution (chiefly) Staff of local Authority
4.	Local Authority or Insitution, and teacher based	Local Authority/ Local Institution	Staff of local Authority/Institution and local teachers (in varying mixture)
5.	School-based	Central/Local Authority	Head teacher and other teachers in the school
6.	Co-operatively based	Central-and-Branch Co-operative	Teacher-members
7.	Individually based	The individual teacher (sometimes with central or local subsidy and guidance)	The individual teacher

Yarger, although more limited in his perspective as his research has focused primarily on centers in the United States, has also developed a typology. He attempts to classify types of teacher centres. Since teacher centres in this country, as in other countries, run the penumbra from store front "operations" manned by a single teacher to large state-controlled networks, some attempt at an explanatory system that describes the various ways in which centers are organized and the distinctive types of functions which they serve is in order. His typology follows:

The Independent Teacher Center. This type of center is characterized by the absence of any formal affiliation with an established institution. Without the red tape of bureaucracy, program directors, wardens, and implementers experience a tremendous amount of freedom and flexibility. They also, however, experience the lack of financial security that the bureaucracy often provides. Teachers become involved with this type of center on a purely voluntary basis; thus the center tends to have high teacher credibility. Independent teacher centers typically deal with individual teacher needs rather than with complex institutional concerns.

The "Almost" Independent Teacher Center. An "almost" independent center isn't independent; it just thinks it is! Although formally linked with an educational institution (either a college or school system), a high degree of autonomy is evident. This autonomy is usually linked to the charisma or influence of the personnel in the center. As with the independent center, involvement is voluntary, and the emphasis is usually away from institutional goals and toward the perceived needs of either the teachers or the leaders of the center. Although the center is subject to some institutional pressure, the ability to remain autonomous is its most distinguishing characteristic.

The Professional Organization Teacher Center. Two kinds of professional organization centers appear to be emerging: the "negotiated" teacher association center and the "subject area" (e.g., social studies) center. The former emerges from the formal bargaining procedures with a school system, while the latter usually comes out of the concerns of a particular subject-focused professional organization and shares many features with the independent center. Although both are rare in American education, the negotiated center tends to focus on professional as well as educational problems, while the subject center usually emphasizes a particular high-priority

classroom subject. In either case, the related professional organization is the dominant force in the governance structure.

The Single Unit Teacher Center. Probably the most common type of American center, the single unit teacher center is characterized by it's association with and administration by a single educational institution. Although often difficult to distinguish from conventional inservice programs, the center typically has a high level of organization, more sophisticated program development, and more thoroughly developed institutional goals. A low level of parity exists, with accountability the exclusive province of the institutional administration. External resources and funds are often used, but are always institutionally administered. Program development in this type of center is closely tied to approved institutional goals.

The Free Partnership Teacher Center. This type of center represents the simplest form of those based on the concept of a consortium. Usually the partnership involves a school system and a university or college. It could, however, involve two school systems, two universities, or even a non-educational agency. The popularity of the partnership suggests that a two-party relationship is easier to initiate and maintain than a consortium involving three or more discrete institutions. The word free refers to the fact that the partnership is entered into willingly, rather than being prescribed legislatively or politically. Program development will show evidence of attempts to accommodate the needs and goals of both partners. This type of center often evolves from a single unit center in which a good relationship develops between the sponsoring unit and consultants from other nearby educational institutions.

The Free Consortium Teacher Center. A center of this kind is characterized by three or more institutions willingly entering into a teacher center relationship. Program organization, commitments, and policy considerations are usually more complex and formal than in a partnership. Financial arrangements are also more complex, with external sources of support frequently the primary reason for creating a consortium. Program development tends to be more general, as the goals and constraints of each party must be taken into account. The permanence of this type of center is often related to the ability of member institutions and their constituencies to see merit in the programs. "First phase" development usually takes much longer than with most other center types because of the need for building trust among a complex mix of participants, but the lone-range payoff and potential large-scale impact often make the early "spider dances" worthwhile.

The Legislative/Political Consortium Teacher Center. The organization and constituency of this type of center is prescribed either by legislative mandate or by political influence. Often, but not always, a State Department of Education in the United States at least, oversees the process. In a sense, it is a "forced" consortium. Although participation by eligible institutions tends to be quite varied, there is often a financial incentive to participate. A rather complex communication system is frequently used to assist the administering agency in program development. This type of center is frequently organized with regard to county boundaries, but the organization may range from a subcounty to a total state model. In some states it has also been proposed that the center should become the institution which recommends candidates for professional teaching certificates.

Yarger acknowledges that likely no individual teacher center is organized as "purely" as this typology implies. However, he suggests that if one analyzes ongoing teacher center programs as he has, there is a strong likelihood that a dominant organizational pattern will emerge that forms a reasonable "fit" with one of the seven types above. Secondary organizational characteristics are also likely to be found because of the diversity and complexity of centers which exist.

Gaining more insight into how a teacher center is organized is a necessary but not sufficient condition for understanding this concept. In order to assess the potential of teacher centers one must also understand the functions they serve. Relationships between structure and function are likely to exist, and one should examine both. Again Yarger identifies primary functional responsibilities.

The Facilitation Type Teacher Center. This is much like "English"-type teacher center. It is informal and almost unprogrammatic. It turns on the creation of an environment in which teachers explore curriculum materials and help each other think out approaches to teaching. Such a center seeks to improve the collegial activity of the teacher. This type of center purports to provide an atmosphere which will enable the teacher to explore new ideas and techniques either through direct interaction with other teachers or via "hands-on" experience with new curriculum materials. No specific program is offered, and professional growth is a function of the unique needs and initiatives of the individuals who voluntarily come to the center. Quite simply, it is intended to facilitate a teacher's personal and professional development. It serves a heuristic, "collegial," almost social-educational function.

The Advocacy Type Teacher Center. An advocacy type teacher center is characterized by a particular philosophical or programmatic commitment. Although usually explicit, the advocacy may simply be the result of committed professionals with common beliefs joining together in the same teacher center. These centers may advocate such things as open education, competency-based education, differentiated staffing, multi-unit schools, and so on. The key element is that the teaching center has a visible "thrust" and is committed to a particular philosophy, orientation, or educational movement. Advocacy centers are usually limited to a single educational orientation, such as open education.

The Responsive Type Teacher Center. American education fosters at least two kinds of responsive centers. The first attempts to respond to the specific needs of individual educators, while the second focuses on specified institutional needs. They are likely to exist in very different organizational structures. In both cases, however, there is an implied needs assessment, and a commitment to develop a program in accordance with mutually derived objectives. The center promotes itself not as a philosophically embedded organization, but rather as one designed to help a potential client better understand a problem and then to provide resources and/or training aimed at solving that problem. Programming is usually diverse, with heavy reliance on external resources.

The Functionally Unique Teacher Center. Some teacher centers serve rather limited, unique functions. These may include materials development, research, and/or field testing of available materials. In some cases, such a center may have developed from a program that originally had a totally different purpose. For example, suppose an experimental classroom in a single school is set up to provide service to a particular kind

of child. As its popularity grows, teachers visit it with increasing regularity to see the materials, observe the instructional techniques, and solicit counsel from the teacher. In this case, the resulting teacher center is more directly child-centered than most. In fact, program personnel would probably have to make many changes in order to accommodate to the new, unique teacher center function.

Yarger reminds us that in any attempt to use these typologies or categories to study teacher centers it should be kept in mind that operating teacher center models are likely to be neither pure nor consistent with respect to his categories. Nonetheless he sees three useful purposes for the typologies. First and of most immediate importance, they can be used as a basis for more systematic communication about and analysis of teacher centers. It appears to this author that the specific centers which are briefly described in Appendix A of this report can be analyzed using his framework for example. Second, a heuristic function may be served. Using the typologies as a means of articulating differences, research can be designed of a comparative nature. Finally, and perhaps of the greatest importance in the long run, this attempt at differentiating types of centers may be able to assist program designers build the kind of teacher center programs that most closely relate to their specific situational needs.

Thus we have basically an umbrella term--teacher or teachers' centers--which has gained widespread popularity in several countries, employed to describe what are commonly forms of school-focused INSET. Teachers, as the term denotes, are commonly more responsible than they historically have been for decisions about INSET in these renewal efforts. The term teacher centers therefore frequently communicates more about who is involved than what actually occurs. More precision and clarity is needed not only in terms of the governance

arrangements, organizational schemes and functional responsibilities taken on by various centers, but in terms of the actual inservice modalities teachers participate in and the various effects of these. There is little doubt that many of these centers have facilitated forms or modes of school-focused INSET. What is not as clear is whether or how more powerful learning for teachers is resulting or what the multiple effects of a more participatory approach to INSET are.

SUMMARY

This report has attempted to synthesize some of the thinking about and examples of school-focused INSET which has evolved in the various case studies and conferences sponsored by CERI/OECD. While the term school-focused inservice is hardly a household word and the activities it suggests are hardly the modal form of continuing education for teachers, the idea of the school as a primary focus for development is rationally defensible and growing in popularity. Increasingly the interrelated nature of organizational and curricular renewal with inservice teacher education is being acknowledged. While much of inservice today is atheoretical and lacking in both conceptual coherency and operational continuity, a better understanding of the powerful interactions between the person (teacher) and the workplace (school) is in evidence and from this perspective this suggests a continued move in the direction of school-focused INSET.

It would be naive, however, to predict either a rapid or greatly expanded move in this direction solely on the basis of enlightened thinking about the continuing education of teachers. Political and economic considerations, at least in the immediate future, would appear to have the potential for greater impact upon INSET. And it should be underscored here that notwithstanding the increased authority of teachers in matters of inservice and the push for more economical means of education, school-focused INSET is not simply a matter of

enhanced participation by teachers (as appears the case in some inservice efforts termed teacher centers) nor a more inexpensive way for teachers to continue to grow. It is rather a concept which has the potential for greater communication with the ultimate consumer (student and parent) than most "teacher response" models and for more powerful and coherently planned activities which will often times be more expensive. Politics and economics are major issues to contend with.

No consensual definition of school-focused INSET was attempted in this paper. However, major characteristics of this form of inservice were identified and the undergirding disciplines from which knowledge can be drawn and developed to provide a more coherent empirical/conceptual base were noted. At this time there appears to be ample testimony based upon first-hand experiences at least that the following are desirable features of school-focused INSET:

(1) It is viewed as but one aspect, however crucial, of a larger scheme of continuing development

(2) assumptions about how adults (teachers) best learn and continue to develop along several dimensions are frequently made explicit

(3) interactions between the teacher as person, the teacher as learner, and the teacher as teacher in the school site are often given due consideration in designing school-focused INSET

(4) interactions between organizational change, curricular change and INSET are often noted and incorporated into planning; implications for resocialization and role-change are given special attention

(5) teachers are centrally involved

(6) needs and interests of students and parents are of special importance in this form of inservice.

(7) attention is given not only to individual teachers but to key functioning groups and entire faculties

(8) regardless of the number of teachers or size of group, individual differences are accommodated.

(9) school-focused INSET often goes beyond the sharing of ideas to include demonstration, experimentation, supervised trials and feedback

(10) building administrations may assume a number of responsibilities in this endeavor but the most critical one is a reciprocal responsibility to provide both material and psychological support for teachers who venture into new growth experiences

(11) there is continuity; INSET is seen as a process, often a developmental or incremental one, and not an event

(12) there are ample opportunities for reflection about as well as action in what one is doing and consideration of alternatives

(13) school-focused inservice frequently is concerned with teacher changes which are implied in resolving cross-cutting school problems of mutual concern

(14) school-focused inservice is often embedded in experimentation which is integral to the daily instructional tasks of the teacher; it is differentiated from teaching only by its intent and the type of examination and sharing which takes place later

(15) school-focused inservice has as a primary focus quality education for students in a given school through quality education of the teacher.

Certainly the above list of characteristics is not exhaustive; other important elements could likely be noted. Issue as well could obviously be taken with some of the above statements. This review of the case studies and conferences nonetheless has provided more clarity with respect to the concept. These deliberations also underscored quite clearly the fundamental issues which have to be better addressed. These include allocating more reasonable and appropriate

periods of times for INSET and relating INSET to more powerful motivational concerns of teachers such as status, career growth, and in many cases a more civilized and doable teacher role. Matters of economic support, improved leadership capacity, greatly increased coordination and cooperation between diverse agents and agencies in many situations, and more rigorous research and evaluation were also commonly noted as problems to be contended with in the CERI/OECD literature.

This synthesis paper has attempted to demonstrate in the section titled the General State of the Art how many of the above problems still exist in many places. The paper has also attempted to suggest appropriate functions which various role groups, agencies and organizations might assume in effectively resolving these problems. Actions which teachers, teacher organizers, administrators, the community, those in higher education/teacher education and various governmental roles might pursue in bettering school-focused INSET are reviewed from the CERI/OECD-sponsored papers and conferences. Hopefully, this sharing of both the promise and the problems of school-focused INSET in various countries and cultures will be of some assistance to those who are working toward better continuing education for teachers. The knowledge that the task is not an easy one but that a variety of persons in divergent places are nonetheless making progress should be reassuring.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACSTT, " Inservice Education and Training: Some Considerations" (A Discussion Paper), London, England, 1979.

Bolam, Ray: Baker, Keith, "Schools and In-Service Teacher Education Project, Project Outline and Rationale" (Mimeograph), Bristol, 1979.

British Schools Council Report, 1975.

Caston, Geoffry, "The Schools Council in Context," Journal of Teacher Education, May, 1971.

Department of Education and Science and the Welsh Office, STP Ltd., Chesham, England, November, 1978.

Devaney, Kathleen: Teachers' Centres in the United States in "In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Towards School-Focused Training. IV. The United States experience - CERI/OECD, Paris, 1980.

Fallon, Barry and Felicity: Teachers' Centres in Australia in: "In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Towards School-focused Training. V. Teachers' Centres in Australia and United Kingdom - CERI/OECD, Paris, 1978

Forrest, A: In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Towards School-focused Training. III. The New Zealand experience - CERI/OECD, Paris 1980

Fox, Thomas: The Evaluation of School Focused INSET Programs in Four OECD Member Countries. (A Working Draft), Madison, Wisconsin, United States, September, 1978.

Fullan, Michael: In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Towards School-Focused Training. II. The Canadian Experience - CERI/OECD, Paris 1980

Griggs, Audrey with Gregory, John: Teachers' Centres in the United Kingdom in In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Towards School-focused Training. V. Teachers' Centres in Australia and United Kingdom CERI/OECD, Paris, 1978

Groenhagen, Berend: Educational Guidance Services in the Netherlands. CERI/OECD, Paris, 1978

Hall, Gene E.: and Loucks, Susan: "Teacher Concerns as a Basis for Facilitating and Personalizing Staff Development," Teachers College Record: September, 1978, Volume 80, Number1, p. 36-53.

Havelock, R. G.: The Utilization of Educational Research and Development. British Journal of Educational Technology.2 (2). 1971, pp. 84-97.

Howey, Kenneth R: International Workshop on Strategies for School-Focused In-Service Education and Training (INSET), West Palm Beach, Florida, United States, 6th-9th November, 1977, CERI/OECD, Paris 1978 (mimeograph)

Howey, Kenneth R.: School-Focused Inservice Education in the United States, (Draft Copy), Minneapolis, Minnesota, U.S.A. August 1979.

Howey, Kenneth R.: "Putting Inservice Teacher Education Into Perspective," The Journal of Teacher Education: Washington, D.C. Summer 1976.

Henderson, Evan S.: "The Concept of School-Focused Inservice Education and Training," British Journal of Teacher Education. Vol. S., No. 1. January 1979.

Ingvarson, Lawrence et al., "In-Service Education and Training of Teachers - Towards School-Focused Training. I. The Australian experience CERI/OECD Paris 1980

Joyce, Bruce: "In-Service: New Perspectives or an Old Term." Presentation of Symposium on In-Service: A Means of Progress in Tough Times, Simon Fraser University, May 1979.

Joyce, Bruce R.: (Editor) Involvement: A Study of Shared Governance of Teacher Education, National Dissemination Center, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, 1978.

McLaughlin, Milbrey W.: Marsh, David D.: "Staff Development and School Change," Teachers College Record, Volume 80, Number 1. September 1978, pp 69-94.

Nash, Chris: Ireland, D.: "In-Service Education: Cornerstone of Curriculum Development - or Stumbling Block?" Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Saskatoon 1979.

OECD/CERI; Report of an International Workshop/Conference on Strategies for School-focused Inservice Education and Training (Report prepared by Kenneth Howey) Washington, D.C., 1978.

Perry, Pauline: Conference on Strategies for School-focused Support Structure For Teachers in Change and Innovation: Stockholm, 20th-22nd October 1976. Final conclusions of the Conference, CERI/OECD, Paris, 1977 (Mimeograph)

Schools Commission Report for the Triennium 1978-81 Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1978.

Schools in Australia (1973) Report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission. Australian Government Printing Service.

Skinner, Joyce: International Workshop on School-focused In-Service Education of Teachers (INSET) Bournemouth, England, 1st-3rd March, 1978. Follow-up to the Conference on Strategies for School-focused Support Structures for Teachers in Change and Innovation held in Stockholm, 20th-22nd October, 1976. General Report and Conclusions. CERI/OECD, Paris 1978 (Mimeograph)

Taylor, L. C. "Characteristics Which Define a Teachers' Center", (A shared unpublished manuscript), June 1979.

Vincentini-Missoni, M.: Teachers' Centres in Italy, CERI/OECD, Paris, 1978.

Yarger, Sam T; Howey, Kenneth R.: Joyce, Bruce R.: A National Study of Inservic: Teacher Education, (In Press), Washington, D.C., 1979.

Yarger, Sam T.: "Teacher Centres in the United States," (A shared unpublished manuscript), Syracuse, New York, August 1979.